THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCIX.] MAY, 1862. [Vol. XVIII.

DR. RINSE POSTHUMUS.

De Vrije Fries, giving an account of the proceedings of the Frisian Society of Arts, History and Literature, has a very interesting biography of a distinguished man whose name is almost wholly unknown to English readers. Rinse Posthumus was minister of the Reformed Church at Waaxens and Brantgum, in the province of Friesland. He was not only eminent for his general acquirements, but as the translator of Shakspeare has a special claim to the attention of our countrymen.

It is little more than half a century ago that the Frieslanders had few or no proper names among them, but were known, as were anciently the Anglo-Saxons (whom they much resemble in character and habit), by some designation descriptive of place or person, such as John of Leeuwarden, William Strongi'th'arm, Stupid Dick and such like. When Napoleon introduced the conscription into Holland, he compelled all the natives to adopt some family name, and the illustrious patronymics of Greece and Rome were among the most popular. Such are Julius and Augustus, Constantine, Posthumus and many others.

Of all living and spoken languages, the Frisian most resembles the old tongue of England.

"Butter, bread and green cheese,
Is good English and good Frise,"

is a sentence I have heard a hundred times from Frisian lips. In fact, the earliest of the migrations into England were from the Frisian districts. Before the Heptarchy, the languages of a large portion of the English and the Gothic races were nearly identical. The *wetten* or laws which are preserved in the ancient idiom may be read with little difficulty by any who have made themselves acquainted with the earliest forms in which the Anglo-Saxon was used by our progenitors.* It is well known that the German translations of Shakspeare are among the most perfect works of scholarship, any and all the forms of Gothic phrase lending themselves so easily and so appropriately to the phraseology of our

* Prologue to Melibœus:

"I would you tell a little thing in prose
That might liken you."

"Ik wol you'n lyts ding yn prose telle dat you lykje mat" (Frisian translation).

great dramatist. But perhaps of all languages the Frisian is that in which the sense can be most clearly conveyed—*overset* is the Frisian word—and often the *ipsissima verba,* with slight modifications of orthography, employed.*

The biographer (Dr. J. H. Halbertsma) gives a long and attractive account of the intercourse between Dr. Posthumus and his friend John Bowring, who in 1828 paid him a visit at his rural abode. Their pursuits had been in many respects similar, and between them there was a strong sympathy. While one had lived a life of study and seclusion, the other had been a great traveller and had known many of the most distinguished men of Europe. Each was able to gratify the curiosity and assist the inquiries of the other. Posthumus expresses his surprise at the odd application which his guest made of the stenographic art. "He put down the prices of food and the cost of labour; he told me all about the rich as well as the poor, how they lived and what they thought and what they said." The subject which seemed to have most attraction for Posthumus was Bentham's philosophy, of which he considered Bowring as the apostle. "What depth, what grandeur," said he, "are in the words, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'! What a text for the moralist and the legislator!" Posthumus proclaimed it to be an axiom of daily and hourly use, and which helped the solution of multitudinous difficulties which had been floating in his mind. Posthumus was greatly delighted that Bowring had come to inform himself about Friesland and the Frieslanders in the pastoral abode of Waaxens and under the guidance of his friend, and hoped through him to arouse some attention to Frisian literature among the learned in Great Britain. Bowring translated into English the most celebrated of Japicx's poems, and wrote more than one article on the subject in English reviews. Posthumus was a worshiper of Shakspeare, and his knowledge of our language, especially in the era of the great dramatists, was such that he had little to learn from his visitor in that portion of the field, but there were others which he was desirous of cultivating. Though too sensible a man to be the slave of prejudice, there was in the mind of Posthumus a great leaning towards England, her authors and her institutions; and he liked to point out the resemblance between his countrymen and ours, and to talk over the olden time when they might have held colloquial intercourse without the intervention of an interpreter.

Gysbert Japicx was an object of Posthumus' warmest admiration. His poems are the best specimens of the modern Frisian. He was an incarnation of the Frisian spirit, of sound understanding, courageous utterance, sensible and energetic, pursuing an

* It is strange that Dr. Craik, in his elaborate and in most respects satisfactory account of the English Literature and Language, should have failed to direct attention to the Frisian field.

honest career in all the strength of honesty, truthful in his portraiture, the fruit of close observation, his style correct and simple. He was Posthumus' model, and not a word had he written which was not impressed on the mind and memory of his follower. It has been said that the style of one is not to be distinguished from that of the other. But the speculations of Posthumus were wider, higher, than those of his predecessor, and indeed no Frisian writer approaches him in these respects. Althusius published in 1755 a rhymed translation of Japicx's version of the Psalms. Hoekstra, Professor of History in the College of Louvain, made the Frisian language the subject of his teaching. Japicx had many admirers and followers. The Frisian like to compare his influence in Friesland with that of Shakspeare throughout the world. The resemblance holds as to the general character; it is superfluous to add there is little of comparison in the degree or extent of influence; but Japicx may be admitted among

> "The poets—
> Honour be with them and eternal praise!
> The poets! who on earth have made us heirs
> Of heaven and pure delight with their sweet lays."

Posthumus was born on the 30th October, 1790, in Ternaard, a village in northern Friesland. His father was a farmer, an intelligent agriculturist, much respected by the peasantry around him. Subject to few temptations, his career was honoured and honourable. He would have had his son follow in his footsteps; but the youth was seldom in the fields without a book in his hand or his bosom. He thought more of the flowers turned up by the plough than of the depth or straightness of the furrows it indented. His father found him an indocile learner; in fact, "his thoughts were otherwhere."

As the twig was bent so was the tree inclined; and the lad was sent to pursue his classical studies at Groningen. His father would have him pursue medical studies, but theology had more attractions, and for two years he attended the lectures of Ype Finga and H. Muntinghe, men renowned in their day. Having passed the accustomed examination, Posthumus was appointed pastor and teacher in Waaxens and Brantgum, and his first sermon was from the text, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us" (1 Cor. iv. 7). Here he began and here he ended his clerical course. He married in 1816, had three daughters, and in 1855 his fortieth year of religious administration was commemorated from Romans i. 16—"I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." He died on the 28th September, 1859.

In person Dr. Posthumus was a fine representative of the

Frisian race: of middle stature, with black hair, robust and energetic, somewhat disposed to taciturnity; but when he spoke, his language was powerful and original. He enjoyed intercourse with the peasantry, but broke away from the presumptuous and little learned, who but too often desire rather to dictate to than to learn from their superiors. He had strong affections and a warm patriotism, which found delight in human progress, whether at home or abroad. His flock was harmoniously bound together and earnestly attached to their shepherd. He saw his native land pass through many sorrows and vicissitudes, and at times was saddened and perplexed by its uncertain futurity. The uprising of Italy awakened all his enthusiasm, and his friend and biographer records the workings of his generous mind as he contemplated the beautiful country "divided by Alps and Appenines and circled by the sea," but under the phase described by Alfieri when indulging in the "silenzio figlia d'alta vendetta,"—the stillness which dreamed of vengeance, the agony which felt the heavy chains:

"Schiavi, si, ma schiavi ognor frementi;"

and in that grander hour when her ancient spirit rose like a giant refreshed, emancipated herself from the intolerable yoke, and laid the foundations of a mighty nation, entering upon the inheritance of more than her ancient glory. These events threw light upon the darkness of his dying day; and when he fell asleep, it seemed but the continuation of a repose which was patient in its wakefulness, tranquil in its rest, and always resigned and grateful.

Independent in his opinions and frank in their expression, he was an admirable example of Friesland's best characteristics and peculiarities.* The Frieslander as little resembles the Dutchman or Hollander as does the Celt the Saxon. Their languages have no doubt more affinity, but there is a sort of border spirit which leads to alienation and repulsion. Perhaps the Dutch or Fleming is somewhat disposed to look down upon the Frieslander, and holds in some contempt the language and the literature which the verses of Gysbert Japicx have endeared to his countrymen. The Frisians are proud of their origin and of the laws of their forefathers. There is an aristocracy of feeling which repulses the "outlander," and this aristocracy is bedded deeply in the democratic field. A Frisian boor has been known to refuse to uncover his head in the presence of a Dutch nobleman, and when ordered to do so, replied, "Remember, greatman (grietman), that the gold which bought my hat was as good as

* Buonaparte thought highly of the soldiers of Friesland. They were a verification of his dictum, "Victory is in the legs;" for they could endure long marches, and their strong bones and robust limbs fitted them for great exertions and made them swift of foot. The French frequently attributed the success of the Emperor to his rapid marches and countermarches.

that which purchased yours." Many are the tales told of the manner in which Frisian peasants have resented an indignity. So says the poet:

"Our characters are by our soils supplied:
A Roman is a slave—a Briton, free;
To have no master is a Frisian's pride,
To serve a master is a Frenchman's glee."

In his sermons Posthumus had most at heart to make himself thoroughly understood by the least opulent part of his congregation. When he heard the hypercritical laud an obscure but pompous discourse, he said, "Such luxuries are not for us; they are for the tables of the rich." Like his Divine Master, "the common people heard him gladly." Not that he despised knowledge; for books and maps, especially those connected with Friesland, were his habitual companions; but he intruded neither science nor philosophy when they could not be understood or appreciated. He travelled little, except to explore every recess of his own province, in which the diversities of idiom and habits between the town and country people were matters of much amusement to him. If a voyage round one's own apartments has been sufficient to furnish pabulum for a volume, Frisia, his own Frisia, was a topic absolutely inexhaustible.

So said he:

"Friesland! Friesland! thou shalt never
Even in death forgotten be;
No! thy hero-fame for ever
Will I cherish tenderly,
Will I cherish tenderly."*

There is an amusing anecdote told of Posthumus, which reminds one of Cromwell's order "to trust in God and keep the powder dry," as of Lord Palmerston's hint to the Edinburgh clergy, that when they fasted for the ravages of epidemy, it would be well if they looked to the drainage of their city. In a voyage on one of the Dutch inland seas, they were overtaken by a storm, and as darkness came on the captain gave himself up to despair, and, abandoning all care of his vessel, ran to Dominus Posthumus and implored him to pray. "Pray—no! I had rather fiddle. This is not your place. To the rudder—to the rudder! Do you think God will work a miracle because you neglect your duty? This is no time for your cowardice, but to shew the heart of a lion." The captain called Posthumus and his companion heathens; but he left them, seized the helm, and the vessel was saved. "Aide toi, Dieu t'aidera!"

---

* "Frieslân, Frieslân, dy vorjitte
Schil ik in het tjustre graef;
In dijn heldenrom uwtmitte
Sa lang as ik siikje kin,
Sa lang as ik siikje kin."—P. 279.

Posthumus was disgusted with the tone of too many of the ecclesiastical controversies in Holland. There, as elsewhere, the Church hierarchy has shewn too much disposition to lord it over men's souls, and to dogmatize and anathematize rather than win by gentleness and instruct with patience. "What wandering is here," he exclaimed. "from the law of the Gospels! One would almost fancy that the Pharisees, when scattered at the destruction of Jerusalem, had found their way hither and erected their temple in our land!" Naturally enough, Posthumus became obnoxious to men who would have the understanding and the will subject to their domination; but this only endeared him to those who could appreciate his independent spirit. "We live in a strange world," said one of the learned men of the time. "In great things and small, a domineering masterdom will intrude. You only take a pinch of snuff, and a hand conveys the box away and proclaims, 'I will be your rappee.' You are reading your Bible; it is suddenly made away with, and a loud-voiced doctor exclaims, 'I am your Bible.'" Some of the axioms of the time are curious and characteristic. "Rather work by the lightning of your deeds than by the thundering of your words," was the teaching of a Frisian domine. Another gave a strange reason for a sermon on death: "I shall preach to you next Sunday about the grave, for no one has lately died amongst us."*

Independently of his Frisian writings, which were connected principally with the literature of his native province, Posthumus took part in the controversies in which the Reformed Church of Holland was engaged. He translated from the French, Pascal's Pensées sur la Religion; from the German, Seume's Apocryphen; and from the English, an account of the Sac-North American Indians, especially with reference to the state of religion among them. He took an earnest part in the advocacy of the local rights of the Frieslanders, when he deemed them to be invaded, both by his pen and his voice, being always with the advanced guard of patriots and advocates of liberty. This passionate love of freedom may be pointed at as the guide-star of the whole of his thoughts, alike in the field of religion and of politics; and perhaps no better place can be found for the selection of some passages of his poetry, whose translation follows:

Wees vrij O mensch!

"Be free, O man! so God's command hath spoken,
And thine obedience shall be thy reward.
Continue free! his holy word unbroken,
Thee from all sorrows, all regrets shall guard.
Man! thou wert born to greatness—dost inherit
A noble rank, a law of liberty;

* "Ik nedigje jimme takomme Snein op bigraffenis mar er wirde nin liedboalen bi juwn."—P. 234.

But there is neither recompence nor merit
For him who knows not to be greatly free."

Wat slaafsche geest.

"What slumbering spirit may not God awake,
The agent of his purposes to make?
The winds by princes and by priests protected,
Shall not God's lily-bank of flowerets kill?
No! these shall be by Christus all rejected;
He is our hope, our help, our safeguard still.
I see the martyr's fires commix their rays
With freedom's flame and with the light of heaven;
Up to Christ's throne they rise in prayer and praise,
And mingle what's divine with earthly leaven.
Yes! that bright fire shall burn—that fire of freedom,
Till by the power of progress, banned and doomed,
All wrongs shall be redressed—all laws that breed them
Have their repeal—their records all consumed.
O how my spirit in that wreck rejoices!
Upsoaring on emancipated wing,
And listening to and mingling with the voices
That round the throne of the Redeemer sing!
Socinus, Berengaren, Scotus, I,
With Luther, Menno, Zwinglus, Calvin, all,
Their light rejoice in and their memory.
Yet none among them will I *master* call;
One is my *Master*—Freedom is my claim;
I'm pledged to her and to her guidance; never,
Happen what may, will I desert her name,
But on her basis build my hopes for ever."—*Uitboezeming.*

Like many of his countrymen, the attachment to the old republican forms of government was deeply rooted within him. And no wonder; for what Dutchman could look back upon the glorious history of his commonwealth without strong emotions of pride, and regret that a state of things so honourable to the Netherlands had passed away? The intrusive government of King Louis, forced upon them by the first Napoleon, could not but be intolerable: its object was to denationalize the Dutch people, and to merge them in the vortex of French habits and interests—to supplant their language—to uproot their institutions. Is it a matter of surprise that the whole country rose up at the cry of *Oranje Boven!*—Up with Orange? or that the delight of being emancipated from the Gallic yoke was too strong not to be used for royalist objects by the Dutch King? He was popular then, and known as *Vader Willem;* and Posthumus, who under the French rule had said, "He who governs the land must govern me," might well rejoice in the promise of better days; but he was not satisfied with the inertness exhibited by his countrymen, and in 1840 published "A Word for the Awakening of Public Spirit in silent Friesland;" and again, in 1846, another pamphlet, "On Popular Feeling as displayed in its own Nature, and its Influ-

ence on the National Happiness." He also wrote on the Reform of the Poor Laws (a question then agitated in England), and on the means of finding employment for the distressed, and especially for destitute children. There was much suffering in Holland, and a strong tide of emigration setting in to the United States of America; and the Dutch were among the best of the emigrants; they took with them no *agitating* topics, as did too many of the Irish settlers, and as intelligent agriculturists and industrious traders could not but be welcome to a land in which their ancestors, when New York bore the name of Amsterdam, had been so successfully located. To this hour many of the leading families of the "empire city" retain Dutch names, and have preserved the language of their forefathers; they have reached the highest offices of the state, and still form a large proportion of "the upper ten thousand" whom the Americans are fond of calling their native nobility. A sister of Posthumus accompanied her brother-in-law to the land of promise.

Posthumus was not only the religious but the medical adviser of his parish. He gave his attention particularly to the diseases of the poor, and to epidemics which raged in his neighbourhood, and which, as in the case of cholera, seem to have perplexed the most elaborate and thoughtful investigators into their cause and cure. Among the peasantry, the treatment of maladies is often marked with extravagance,—the remedies employed either baneful or useless. This is a mistake as old as folly is old; for, as the Romans said,

"Stulti cum vitant vitia in contraria currunt,"

and the practice is frequently but a vibration from one extreme to another, each equally perilous.

Again, the reformation of public morals was deemed a paramount duty by Posthumus, not alone by public services, not alone by private visitations, but by earnest co-operation with the many benevolent societies in the possession of which Holland holds a high place among civilized and Christian nations. He reproved that unwillingness to come in contact with vice and misery which is found but too often among fastidious philanthropists. It is not enough to give money—it is not enough to watch the progress of vice and woe from the distance. No! it must be grappled with by personal intercourse. The dirty dens of wretchedness must be visited—their tenants talked to, not as dependents, but as brothers and sisters of humanity. He thought little of fine speeches made by popular orators—pretty notes written by ladies on perfumed paper—all to be reported in the public newspapers. He was not one who built his church for fame, and would have his name engraved upon its monuments. One wanderer reclaimed from the error of his ways, one miserable being made happy, a sorrow soothed, a joy created,—these were

his trophies; but they were not displayed in the market-place. A valuable contribution of Posthumus in reference to this subject was published by him a year before his death, under the title of "Philanthropy, its Essence, Works and Wanderings." But perhaps the most elevated of the published compositions of Posthumus is that entitled, "God's Greatme yn it Greate end yn it Litste"—"God's Greatness in what is Great and what is Small." His observation of English society led him to the conclusion that we have much *benevolence* which is not really *beneficent;* that many of our institutions deemed philanthropic are practically more pernicious than praiseworthy; that there is a great waste of wealth on unworthy objects; and that in very many cases the money contributed by the charitable might be much more profitably employed in the field of active Christian usefulness. There are many impulses, seemingly virtuous, which lead us astray; and thoughtful observers at home have, it is believed, in many cases agreed with travellers from abroad, that the too indiscriminate and profuse diffusion of what is generally called charity may create more evils than it removes. Posthumus thought that people were too fond of wandering round and round the object to be relieved, instead of instituting a close and thorough examination; that there was rather a disposition to accommodate the state of matters to some preconceived theory, than to look it full in the face, and, as Shakspeare counsels, to allow no *seeming* to supersede a reality. He would have all the tares removed, but that it should first be ascertained they were tares—all flowers preserved, but not till it was certain that they were flowers. It was only the ramification of a lesson to do nothing hastily—the realization of the fine teaching of Göthe, "Ohne hast, ohne rast"—No haste, no rest.

It was one of the pleasant tasks of Posthumus to discover in the writings of Shakspeare words still preserved in Frisian, but which in modern English are obsolete, and others to which English interpreters have given an incorrect meaning. He rejoiced to solve problems which our commentators have left in mystery, and by his Frisian lantern throw light on some Shakspearean obscurities. He attached a high value to the early folio edition of his plays. Beaumont and Fletcher were also ably criticised, as they were highly estimated, by Posthumus. Of the modern commentators on the old dramatists he had not an exalted opinion, and generally found fault with their *restorations* and *emendations*. He was unwilling to admit any fancy version when some Frisian analogy offered a distinct and facile interpretation. He published in the Vrye Fries a vocabulary of words as pronounced in the district of his birth, many of which have only a local existence; to each word he has attached a Dutch translation; and it is the most accredited of Frisian Glossaries.

In 1832, Posthumus undertook, with his friend Haan Hettema,

a journey into Satterland, in order to become better acquainted with the manners and idiom of a people who were a branch of the ancient Frisian race.

His biographer gives many reasons why no statue has been erected to the memory of Posthumus in his native land. Perhaps it is too early; he will be better understood and more justly valued hereafter. He was too proud to find much honour among the rich; and the peasantry considered him only as one of the worthies among themselves—a little wiser and better, but still among them and of them. It is only in our day that Dr. Priestley's statue has found a becoming niche; it is but yesterday that the bust of John Locke was crowned in the county of his birth. The spirit of partizanship, the flattery of the great, raise memorials even to the living; time often reserves its most honourable appreciation for the virtuous dead.

Van der Zwaag pronounced the funeral oration (Hulde aan de nagedachtenis) of Posthumus at the annual meeting of the Frisian Society in February 1860. He describes him under three heads—the Frisian, the free Frisian, and the learned Frisian; and from his words and deeds shews how pre-eminent a position he held, whether as the representative of Frisian nationality, of Frisian love of liberty, and of Frisian learning. Enough has been said to prove how well he deserved these honourable titles. His eulogist describes the power which he held over him during thirty years of friendly intercourse, in which he was privileged to look up to his "guide, philosopher and friend." His disciple was but two-and-twenty years old when he first made the acquaintance of Posthumus, who became more and more deeply seated in his affections as life advanced. Van der Zwaag utters some reproaches upon his countrymen for not being fully alive to the many excellences of his master; but he justly says: "Posthumus was too proud, too high-minded, too self-supported, to seek a shadowy and passing popularity; it is often carelessly scattered and easily won; but in his writings Posthumus lives and will continue to live; his is not a decaying but a growing lustre; his fame will widen and strengthen as it widens." Besides the writings of which we have spoken, there were many others of so local a character that they would have little interest for our readers; and it may be felt by some that a name heard perhaps for the first time by many of them, has occupied more pages of the Christian Reformer than it could have any claim to fill. *Speramus meliora.*

B.

SOME PRE-REQUISITES FOR SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS:

A PAPER READ AT THE MEETING OF THE MANCHESTER SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION.

BY THE REV. JAMES C. STREET.

When Sunday-schools were established, there prevailed a much greater popular ignorance than is the case now; and it was absolutely necessary, if they were to be made of any real, practical utility, that they should aim at furnishing their scholars with the instruments by which knowledge was to be obtained. Their aim was very modest and unambitious. What they sought to do was, to bring out of the streets and lanes the ragged and ignorant children who swarmed there, and to find them something to do which should give them more useful occupation and lift them into a different moral atmosphere. To this was added a simple, elementary instruction in reading and writing, and, as far as practicable, the inculcation of religious precepts and the exhibition of a religious example.

When it is remembered out of what a deep and godly earnestness these Sunday-schools sprang, what strong and pious influences were at work to lead men and women to undertake such duties—in one word, how the spirit of God found its expression in the life of those early teachers, it will not excite surprise that while the mere secular training was inadequately given, the religious instruction should have been of the most devout and solemn character. A long practical acquaintance with Sunday-schools and with the literature created by them, and, especially, a free interchange of thought with men and women, now venerable in years, whose connection with Sunday-schools extends over nearly half a century, lead me to the conclusion that the materials and instruments for giving secular instruction in the early schools were limited and imperfect, while the simple and unaffected piety of the workers gave, unconsciously, a preponderance to the purely religious teaching. While only here and there we find a man or a woman who has gained much secular knowledge from the early Sunday-schools, we find a host start forth to tell us of the religious impressions they there received, and the holy life into which they there were led. Thus while in many cases the aim was principally a secular one, the deep devotion of spirit manifested by the teachers, their purity of disposition, their devotedness of purpose and their beauty of life, led to a powerful religious result. It would be impossible to over-estimate the influence those schools exercised on the practical godliness of this nation. I well remember having heard men and women, with the tears of gratitude in their eyes, speak in glowing terms of the spiritual health and strength they had gained from the Sunday-school. How could it be otherwise, when the teachers with their childlike love and piety were influenced, even more

than they knew, with an overpowering desire to win souls to God, and to gather a harvest-sheaf for heaven? The familiar tones of some old teachers, who had few advantages of culture and few graces of utterance, come back to me from my boyhood's days as I call up my own experience of the Sunday-school. The affectionate counsels, warnings, rebukes and pleadings, are now like spiritual friends to help me on my way of life. Was it not likely that from such teachings religious influences should naturally come?

But while this was the result which came from the early Sunday-schools, a very different one seems to characterize those of to-day. I refer not merely to our Unitarian schools, but also to those of other denominations. *They* have long since come to the conclusion that religious culture is the main purpose of the Sunday-school; and *we*, after long and wearisome debates and experiments, are now in general agreement with them. Though, in deference to local wants and peculiarities, we still in many schools devote our time and strength to secular training, yet we are pretty well agreed as to the great object which should ever be before us, namely, to call forth the religious feelings of those committed to our care. Yet, notwithstanding this, it appears to me that the Sunday-school of to-day, with these aims, is less successful in the development of the religious life, and more so in giving secular training, than at the earlier period to which I have referred. How this has been brought about it is not difficult to say. The large extension of educational facilities in recent years, and the wonderful improvement in the methods of teaching, have combined to give a more systematic, and consequently a more successful, turn to the instructions which have been imparted. The secular training incidentally given even in religious lessons has been more potent in results than that formerly given in Sunday-schools with the avowed purpose of giving the instruments of knowledge. Religious instruction has been given in a way which tended rather to the impartation of knowledge and mental discipline than to the production of spiritual fruits. Teachers have frequently utterly misapprehended the nature and character of religious instruction: while they have refused to spend their time in teaching the alphabet of a secular education, they have felt they were doing their right work in teaching the history, geography and antiquities of the Bible, utterly overlooking the fact that at the best these are but the alphabet, or a portion of the alphabet, of a religious education. Many a scholar who has been under teachers of this kind could pass a pretty close examination in the book of Genesis or the travels of Paul, who would be utterly dumbfounded if you were to ask him the nature of sin or holiness, or the signs of the religious life. But I am inclined to think that the comparative failure of Sunday-schools does not come so much from a misapprehension

of the precise character of the work to be done or the methods of teaching to be adopted, as from the fact that the peculiar spirit which should actuate their promoters has hardly yet been rightly seized. If this be so, we need be at no loss to account for the apparent inconsistent facts, that while it is generally recognized that the main object of the Sunday-school is to develop the religious life, yet the result seems to be rather to improve the character of the secular training.

I think it is now generally admitted that our Sunday-schools are intended for nurseries of the universal church, training-grounds for heaven. They are the gathering-place of young immortals who are to be trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. "The great end of Sunday-schools," says Dr. Channing, "is to awaken the soul of the pupil, to bring his understanding, conscience and heart, into earnest, vigorous action on religious and moral truth, to excite and cherish in him spiritual life. Inward life, force, activity, this it must be our aim to call forth and build up in all our teachings of the young, especially in religious teaching." Accepting this as the sublime work of the Sunday-school, we are prepared to ask what are some essential pre-requisites of those who engage in the office of teaching?

As I am leaving out secular teaching as one of the aims of the Sunday-school teacher, though I am aware that *will* and *must* incidentally be given, so I shall not enter upon the consideration of the mere intellectual qualifications of the teacher. I shall take it for granted that no man or woman will undertake such an office who does not feel on that ground a competency to teach. I pass at once to consider some other pre-requisites.

I observe, first, that the teacher needs a practical, personal experience of the religious life.

There is a sublime mystery underlying this old phraseology, and a fulness of beauty which can only be understood by those who have a true experience of what it is. The aim of the Sunday-school I have said is religious; it follows naturally that the teacher shall be religious. Else how shall the end be gained? What should we think of a man who undertook to occupy the chair of classics at one of our universities who had never heard of Homer or scanned a page of Virgil? Or of a man who assumed the command of an army who knew nothing of military tactics and strategy? Is it less a folly for a man to undertake to be an instructor in religion who has no living and experimental acquaintance with that he would teach? In such a case the teacher might profitably change places with his pupils, for there is in childhood a natural piety so deep and reverential that all its daily life is silently moulded thereby. Any man who comes into such a work without this essential qualification is a hindrance instead of a help to the cause of God. There go

forth from the heart of childhood such tendrils of trust and love, that if they are fixed by the loving hand of genuine experience upon the fruitful soil of faith and hope, they will firmly grasp the eternal verities and send forth their sap so joyously as to give health and vigour to the religious life; but if these tendrils are neglected by the unskilful husbandman and left to perish in the cold or on the barren rock, or if they are permitted to fix themselves in rank and poisonous ground, what painful consequences must ensue! The teacher of religion must himself be permeated with the life of God; the love and trust of his nature must be manifest to the swift instincts of childhood; he must be kindled with religious emotions and sensitive to all higher influences. The great end of his labours must ever be before his eyes, that he may not be daunted by disappointments or dismayed by difficulties. He must be a man who has seized the subtle essence of true religion both in its relation to God and to his brethren; who lays firm hold of piety as our relation to God, and duty as our relation to man. He must have the graces and dispositions which go to make up a glorious human life, and be alive to the beauty and truth of what Wordsworth says—"The child is father to the man." It seems to me a mere truism that our teachers must be religious. Until they are so, whatever secular results may follow their labours, we cannot look for a godly earnestness of life and a thronging crowd of young souls giving a glory and success to the operations of our churches. We want, combined with our higher *aim*, the deeper piety and the more burning zeal which characterized the early efforts of the founders of Sunday-schools.

Secondly, the teacher needs a vivid conception of the greatness of the work he is undertaking.

There is a way of doing greatly the common things of life, and of making grand and noble even the humblest avocations. Humble duties then build up the soul to far cathedral heights of excellence. But there is a way also of dragging down to a grovelling level the loftiest and noblest works. Then they fail to give the discipline for which they were sent. Now I think many of the early teachers, and some few modern teachers, were and are filled with such an exalted conception of their work, that they of necessity reap a rich reward; while, on the contrary, there are many who have formed so poor an idea of the duty they have undertaken, that it would be simple folly to look for any great results. What can you expect from that teacher who goes to a Sunday-school as to dull, dreary task, or who feels it his business merely to keep children out of mischief or from the debasing influences of the street,—who imagines he has done his duty when he has taught his scholars to spell difficult words, or to answer questions from the Bible? I will not say his time is wasted, and that he produces no good results; but I will say, in consequence of

his own poor and false idea, he has failed in gathering a true harvest. How different will be the results gained by that teacher who looks upon the Sunday-school as the garden of the Lord, where young plants are to be nurtured for heaven; who feels that his work is the gravest and the greatest, having to deal with immortal souls at the very period when they are best prepared to receive the deepest impressions; who believes that he is to marshal those young souls through new realms, and to open in them the eye to see spiritual beauties, and the ear to hear spiritual harmonies, so that on all sides they feel themselves enshrined by solemn mysteries and encompassed by the living God! With such a conception of his work, the teacher will be quickened in the divine life, and his scholars will feel themselves gradually and silently passing into a new and rarefied atmosphere of holiness and peace. Let the teacher but have a sufficiently grand idea of his work, and he will be rejoiced with the new results which flow from his efforts. For my own part, I must say that I know not of any work under heaven more important, more honourable, or which is attended with more solemn consequences.

Thirdly, the teacher, being personally religious, and having a vivid conception of the greatness of his work, should possess the faculty of imparting what he knows and feels, and should himself be a learner among learners.

Of the power to impart to others a true idea of our knowledge and emotions, I cannot say much. It is impossible to lay down any precise rules. I believe that the truly religious soul and the reverent nature will as freely and as spontaneously reveal themselves as the rose gives forth its delicious fragrance. Religion cannot be concealed; it glows in the expression of the eye, trembles in the tone of the voice, and thrills with the touch of the hand. Children detect its presence by a natural instinct; for as the pure in heart see God, so they instantaneously perceive the presence of religion. Yet, though this is so, it is possible to cultivate to an almost supernatural extent the power to impart religious impressions. I can well remember a beloved teacher of my own, now in heaven, whose tone and touch thrilled us with religious awe, and whose way of taking the common things of life and using them as vehicles for religious instruction, making everything holy, will never be forgotten by those who were privileged to receive his instructions. Many a lesson did we learn from him. But he sat at the feet of one to whom also we can go. The Sunday-school teacher can have no guide in this matter like Jesus of Nazareth. He taught with a simplicity and power such as the world has never seen in any other. I need not give illustrations of this; for, as you know, the New Testament abounds with them. But the teacher should

cultivate by constant practice the power, by word and look and touch, to convey religious lessons.

I have also said he should be a learner among learners. Let no teacher suppose that he cannot learn from his pupils. Some one has said, if you wish to learn, begin to teach; this is emphatically true in religious matters. The child's nature is a mirror for the Almighty; the dreamy boundlessness of everything there is the best revelation of the infinite, and the simple trustfulness is the best example for mature life. When teacher and scholar sit together looking up into the face of the All-Father, the intellect of the one is made reverent by the love of the other, and both are strengthened. The artless simplicity of childhood sometimes is the best medium by which to see the divinest truths; for there is a beautiful agreement between the holiness which springs from conflict and experience, and the innocence which is fresh from the hands of God; and so through the wondering questionings and startling prattle of a child, the teacher gains a knowledge of sublimest truths. The teacher gives of his experience, the child of his reverence; the teacher of his ascertained facts, the child of his openness of soul. If the teacher will only understand this, he will look reverently into the open souls of his scholars and find God there, and by his experience will turn the child's eye within upon itself that it may see the loving Father.

This combination of the faculty to impart religious knowledge and the perception of a joint discipleship with his pupils, will make the teacher more successful in his work than he had ever before conceived, and cause the fruits of Righteousness and the flowers of Hope to ripen and blossom in abundance and beauty.

Such, then, are some pre-requisites for a Sunday-school teacher: without them he may certainly do some good, but not the highest; with them he will find that he has discovered the way to make the Sunday-school answer its glorious purpose, and promote the happiness of man and the glory of God. Cultivate these graces and dispositions, my friends, and the religious results which shall follow your labours will be more complete and more enduring than those even which followed the early labours of your devout and godly, though uncultured, predecessors.

RELIGION BY INDICTMENT.

A ROBBER and a murderer must be knocked on the head like mad dogs; but we have no great opinion of the possibility of indicting men into piety, or of calling in the Quarter Sessions to the aid of religion.—SYDNEY SMITH.

THE CHARACTER OF ST. PETER.

Lord Lyttleton, in the early part of his excellent tract on the Conversion of St. Paul, says, "I thought the conversion and the apostleship of St. Paul alone, closely considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." In the time in which we live, when not only are attacks continually made by unbelievers on the Christian religion, but when it is threatened with far greater danger by denials by professed Christians of some of the most important, and most strongly asserted facts of the gospel history—the effect of which, if successful, can be no other than to discredit the whole narrative contained in the four Gospels—it cannot, we think, be deemed ill-timed or useless to call the attention of the readers of the Christian Reformer to any part of the evangelical history which may afford an argument in support of its authority. Such an one, we have long thought, is to be found in a consideration of the account of the apostle Peter in the New Testament. We shall endeavour to shew, in the following remarks, that the narrative in question has such marks of truth and reality as must command the assent of every serious and impartial inquirer; and we shall then consider what result may rationally be deduced from the truth of the narrative in question.

St. Peter, during the life of our Saviour, and for some time afterwards, is represented in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles as taking the most prominent part among the apostles. The account of his sayings and doings is full enough of details to enable us to form an accurate notion of his character. Keeping out of sight, as far as it is possible to do so, our opinions on the subject in hand, let us direct our attention to the facts stated by the evangelists, and ask ourselves, whether the narrative to which our attention is to be directed appears in its nature and character to be a credible account, or whether it bears the marks of a fictitious narration. By whomsoever, and at whatever time, the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles were written, it is abundantly clear, from the character of their contents, that the object of their authors was to promote and advance the Christian religion in the world. Now, in attempting to give a rational interpretation of any book, one of the surest and most important rules of interpretation is to keep in view the purpose for which it was written, and to explain it in the manner most consistent with that purpose. In reading, for instance, Hume's account of the civil war in the time of Charles the First, the reader soon becomes aware that the sentiments of the historian were strong in favour of the King; and he will be satisfied that if any undue colouring is given to the statement of facts, the leaning of the historian was on the side of the King and against the Parliament. On the other hand, if we read the works of a very able

living writer, Mr. Forster, on the same period of our history, as we know that his views are directly opposite to those of Hume, we shall be prepared to find that, if there be any prejudice discoverable in his writings, it will be against the King and in favour of the Parliament. If we read the works of two contemporary authors on the same subject, Milton and Lord Clarendon, both of whom were personally engaged in the contest, we shall find these distinguished writers actuated by precisely opposite opinions and feelings,—both unfairly partial to the party to which they belonged, and both giving an unjust and unfavourable colouring to their accounts of the sentiments and conduct of their opponents, and both writing with a virulent spirit incompatible with the dignified and impartial spirit in which history should always be written. We may therefore justly assume that the authors of the books of the New Testament to whom we are indebted for an account of the life of St. Peter, will give the most favourable view which the circumstances admit of, of his conduct and character. We will now proceed to lay before the reader all the information which the New Testament gives us respecting the apostle Peter.

He is first mentioned, in the second chapter of St. John's Gospel, as having been brought to Jesus by his brother Andrew. The only remarkable part of this transaction is, that Jesus says to Simon, which was his original name, "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonah. Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, by interpretation, a stone." The words Cephas and Peter, by the last of which the apostle has been generally called, have the same meaning; and it is afterwards explained by Jesus himself to signify that Peter was a rock on whom he would establish his church. Peter did not at this time become a regular follower of Christ. On a subsequent occasion, he and his brother Andrew, and shortly after James and John, were called to be regular attendants on Jesus, and to take an important part in the promulgation of the religion which he was to establish in the world. Shortly after this event, Jesus cured the mother-in-law of Peter, who was lying ill with a fever; but there is nothing in this transaction illustrative of the character of Peter. In the fifth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, we are informed that Jesus went into Peter's ship, in which he had toiled all night without success to catch fish, and that at the command of Jesus he let down his net and caught a great multitude of fishes. Believing this event to be miraculous, Peter is filled with wonder and awe, and falling down on his knees, he says, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man." Jesus, however, says to him, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." The next narrative in which Peter is concerned, is the restoring to life by Jesus of the daughter of Jairus, on which occasion Peter, James and John are allowed to enter the house of Jairus with our Lord, this being

the first time when these three disciples are distinguished from the others, but of which distinction we shall find several other instances in the progress of the gospel history. After this, Jesus selects twelve of his disciples to be apostles. The only circumstance which requires particular observation in respect to our subject is, that in all the lists of the apostles which are contained in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, and in the Acts of the Apostles, although there are many changes in the order of their names, that of Peter uniformly stands first, and we shall find that he always took the leading part among the apostles.

The next incident in the account of the apostle gives us the first indication of the peculiarities of his character. It is given by the evangelist Matthew (xiv.). After mentioning that the disciples had by the order of their Master gone into a ship to cross the lake of Tiberias, he goes on (ver. 25—32) as follows: "But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves: for the wind was contrary. And in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid. And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased." This passage shews us two traits in the character of Peter—an impulsive temper, and a want of steady resolution. We shall see, in the progress of the narrative, how far his subsequent conduct is marked by these characteristic features.

The most important passage in the New Testament respecting Peter is Matthew xvi. 15—19: "He (Jesus) saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Peter's answer is given in different words, but to the same effect, in the other Gospels,—Mark giving it, "Thou art the Christ," and Luke, "the Christ of God." This is the first time that our Lord declares the great

power which he will confer on his apostles, and it is said of Peter only; but in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, the same power is conferred on the other apostles. Notwithstanding, however, the honourable distinction here conferred on Peter, we find him still very deficient in faith in his Master's predictions; for in the same sixteenth chapter, when Jesus declares that he must suffer many things and be killed at Jerusalem, Peter not only disbelieves him, but proceeds to rebuke him, saying, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee;" which draws from Jesus the severe rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan (that is, thou adversary): thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." So far was the most distinguished of the apostles from fully understanding the character of that religion which their Master was sent into the world to establish. After this time, we find Jesus taking Peter, James and John, into a high mountain, where Moses and Elijah appear, and Jesus, says St. Matthew, "was transfigured before them, and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Mark and Luke give a similar account of this transaction,—the former, however, saying nothing about the shining of his countenance, and Luke only saying, "the fashion of his countenance was altered." Peter then says (Matt. xvii. 4), "Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias." The accounts of the other evangelists are essentially the same, but with some difference of language. There is nothing particular to remark here, except that Peter took the prominent part, as we shall find he usually did, among the apostles. The next time that Peter is particularly mentioned is when the withered fig-tree was blasted; and he is afterwards selected with John to prepare the paschal supper. In these events, however, nothing is found to illustrate the peculiar character of the apostle. The occurrences which took place after the paschal supper deserve our most serious attention. They are thus given by St. John (xiii. 3—10): "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter said unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." This inci-

dent strongly shews the earnestness of Peter's character and his veneration of his Master. In the same chapter we find Peter beckoning to John to inquire of Jesus which of the disciples would betray him. We will now give an extract from St. Matthew's Gospel (xxxvi. 31—35): "Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But after I am risen again, I will go before you into Galilee. Peter answered and said unto him, Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended. Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise also said all the disciples." The account given by St. Mark is to the same purport, except that he says that the words of Jesus were, "Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice" (Mark xiv. 30). Respecting this discrepancy, Dr. Carpenter says (Harmony of the Gospels, p. 253, note): "St. Matthew's words relate to the cock crowing, that which occurred about the commencement of the last watch; St. Mark's, to the earlier cock crowing as well. This evangelist probably learnt the exact expression from the apostle Peter himself." It is a well-known ancient tradition that St. Mark's Gospel was written at the suggestion of St. Peter, or at least under his inspection. There seems no reasonable ground to doubt the truth of this tradition. Observe here, that, although all the disciples profess their resolution never to desert their Master, Peter is the first to make that profession, and is thus the guide and example of the rest. Next follows an account of the most interesting and affecting scene in the Garden of Gethsemane, when Jesus, having taken with him Peter, James and John, and having directed them to watch, goes away and prays, and on his return finds them asleep; and the same thing occurs a second, and a third time. He then rebukes Peter in the first instance, although they were all equally to be blamed, thus giving to Peter the most prominent station. Shortly after this, our Lord is betrayed by Judas Iscariot, and falls into the hands of his inveterate enemies. Here again Peter shews his zeal for his Master by drawing his sword and cutting off the ear of Malchus, one of the high-priest's servants.

We have now arrived at the most important fact in the life of the apostle, so far as this inquiry is concerned—his lamentable denial of his Master. We will give St. Mark's account (xiv. 66—72). The narratives of this transaction in the other evangelists agree in the fact of Peter's having denied three times any knowledge of Jesus, but they differ as to the persons to whom the denial was made, and as to the language used by the apostle and by those who questioned him. This discrepancy would be

fatal to the credibility of the narratives, if we were to hold (as many profess to do) that the Holy Scriptures are all written by the inspiration of God; but to those who consider the Gospels as credible narratives, and ascribe inspiration to those parts only which are said to come from God, the differences between the several Gospels are much the same as constantly occur in courts of justice, when no reasonable person distrusts the testimony of witnesses who agree in the important facts of the case, because they give different accounts of immaterial circumstances which made no deep or correct impression on their minds. Such discrepancies, indeed, tend to establish the truth of the testimony; and a complete agreement on all the minute details of a case will give rise to a suspicion that the whole story is a fabrication. Pretended alibis are sometimes supported with this detailed consistency. We proceed, then, with the account of St. Mark: "And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high-priest: and when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth. But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto. But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak. And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept." Matthew and Luke say, he wept *bitterly*.

At this period all the apostles had forsaken Jesus. John alone returned, and was present at the crucifixion.

After the resurrection of Jesus, we have the following narrative (John xx. 1—8:) "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. So they ran both together, and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. And he stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself. Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the

sepulchre, and he saw, and believed." That is, he believed that the body had been taken away; for it seems clear from the subsequent narratives that none of the apostles believed that Jesus had been raised from the dead, previously to his appearing to them personally. Here we find John waiting till Peter's arrival before he entered the sepulchre, and the latter taking the leading part he had been accustomed to do among the apostles.

Nothing particularly relating to Peter occurs till the last recorded appearance of Jesus, excepting that on his ascension. He had appeared to seven of his disciples as they were fishing; and after having, by their Master's direction, cast their net on the right side of the vessel and caught a great many fishes, the following narrative is given by the apostle John, who was present (xxi. 15—22): "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me. Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." In the reiteration of the question, Lovest thou me? the second and third time, Jesus probably referred, in the gentlest way, to the three denials of Peter, which must have deeply affected him. The apostle John tells us expressly, that the following words of Jesus refer to Peter's death by crucifixion. In the question of Peter respecting the fate of John, we see another instance of the impulsive nature which always led him to take a forward part in whatever was going on.

We have now given all the passages in the Gospels in which Peter takes a prominent part; and we will proceed to see what account is given in the Acts of the Apostles as to his conduct after the ascension of Jesus.

So far were the apostles from understanding the nature and

spirit of the religion which they were destined to promulgate and establish, that, although Jesus had plainly said that his kingdom was not of this world, they still looked to the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. Their question to their Master was (Acts i.), "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Our Lord's answer fully explains the nature of their commission, and the means by which it was to be accomplished (Acts i. 7, 8): "And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." This promise of the Holy Spirit to be given to the apostles was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; previously to which day, however, we find Peter proposing to the disciples to appoint a successor to Judas; which was done accordingly by the election of Matthias.

When the day of Pentecost arrived, the inspiration of the Spirit was given to the disciples, and they were enabled to instruct those who, from different parts of the world, had assembled to keep the Pentecost at Jerusalem, each in their own tongue. Peter then addresses the persons present, asserting the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and that God had made him "both Lord and Christ" (Acts ii. 36). We will here quote some of the words which are spoken of the resurrection of Jesus (ver. 24, 32): "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it: this Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses."

The next incident mentioned in the book of the Acts of the Apostles is that of Peter and John going together to the Temple, and seeing a man, lame from his birth, laid at the gate of the Temple, whom Peter cures of his lameness. He then addresses the bystanders, again asserting the resurrection and the divine authority of Jesus. Peter and John are then taken into custody, and brought before the high-priest and others. Peter addresses them and vindicates what he had done, and asserts the divine authority of Jesus. The apostles are then released; but are charged not to speak, nor teach in the name of Jesus, with which injunction they refuse compliance. After this occurs a transaction in which, as usual, Peter takes the leading part. A man named Ananias had sold some land, and professed to have given the money paid for it to the disciples, but had kept back part of it. Both he and his wife Sapphira having asserted that the whole price of the land had been paid over to the disciples, they are both struck dead as a punishment for their falsehood, Peter having previously addressed each of them separately in very severe terms.

The apostles, having persisted in preaching the gospel, are

again brought before the high-priest and put into prison, from which they are miraculously delivered. The apostles are again taken before the high-priest; and then follows the wise counsel of Gamaliel, part of which, and its results, we shall now shew (Acts v. 38—42). "And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God. And to him they agreed: and when they had called the apostles and beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. And they departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name. And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."

The next transaction recorded of Peter is his being sent with John by the apostles to Samaria, where the gospel had been preached by Philip the deacon. On this occasion, a man named Simon, who had pretended to practise sorcery, but had been converted by Philip, offered money to Peter to confer on him the power of giving the Holy Spirit; for which request he is most severely rebuked by the apostle.

Peter, at the request of Cornelius, was the first of the apostles who preached the gospel to the Gentiles. It is at this time that he makes the declaration, which Christians in all ages have unhappily been very slow to admit, and which indeed, we fear, is now adopted by a very small proportion of those who call themselves Christians (Acts x. 34, 35), "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but that in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Even after this we find that the want of steadiness and consistency in the character of Peter is again made apparent. This appears from the account of his conduct given by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 11—14): "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" Peter, on his return to Jerusalem, is blamed by the Jews for going to the Gentiles; but, on his explaining the circumstances of the case, his accusers are satisfied. After this,

Peter is imprisoned by Herod; but he is delivered out of prison by an angel.

A dispute having arisen at Antioch, by some Jews having insisted that the Gentile converts must be circumcised, Paul and Barnabas are sent to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders on that subject. On that occasion Peter addressed the assembly on behalf of the Gentiles. After Paul and Barnabas were heard, James addresses the meeting, and proposes a resolution, which is agreed to, by which it is declared in favour of the Gentiles on the question in hand. This is the last account we have of Peter. The Epistles ascribed to him do not, we think, bear any relation to the matter in hand.

We will now ask our readers whether, on taking a retrospect of the character of the apostle as displayed in the texts of the New Testament quoted above, it shall appear to them to be a real or a fictitious character. Let them as far as possible lay aside every preconceived opinion and all notion of divine authority in the narratives, and consider the New Testament as a book with which they had been previously unacquainted, in forming an opinion on the question submitted to them. We are willing, for the present, to omit everything of a miraculous character, and shall therefore lay no stress on Peter's attempt to walk on the sea, or to the claim of himself and the other disciples to the miraculous gifts which are said to have been conferred on them on the day of Pentecost,—which, indeed, have no particular bearing and afford no striking illustration on the peculiar character of the apostle. Independently, then, of these real or supposed facts, we ask whether the character of Peter is not marked by peculiarities which give it at least the appearance of reality? We find him on all occasions zealous, active, and the foremost and most prominent character of the body to which he belonged, and we also find him wavering in his conduct and greatly wanting in steadiness and firmness of character. This weakness appears in one of the latest accounts of him—his conduct at Antioch, for which St. Paul justly rebukes him. A character so marked gives a strong impression of reality. In works of fiction, a skilful author will not fail to give such characters to the persons of his story as will interest his readers during the progress of his work; but it very rarely happens that the impression of reality remains when the book is closed. Very few indeed are the authors who possess the marvellous power of drawing characters so apparently real as to make us feel as if we knew them as we do our own friends and acquaintance. Considering the number and variety of his characters, Shakspeare is in this particular unrivalled. A few others have been able to give this appearance of reality to the creations of their imagination. Those who have wept over the sorrows of Clarisse Harlowe, find it difficult to believe her to

be an unreal person. Childhood firmly believes, and mature years find it difficult to reject, the reality of Robinson Crusoe and Friday. We cannot call to mind any other author equal to the three we have mentioned in this respect. The four Gospels are evidently the productions of four individuals, each being distinguished by peculiarities of style and manner, which make it perfectly clear that the same person could not have been the author of them all. There is nothing to shew that St. Luke was not the author of the book of Acts, which is usually ascribed to him. In the Epistle to the Galatians, we have an anecdote of St. Peter given by St. Paul. In all the narratives of these five writers, we find the leading traits of St. Peter's character stated with perfect consistency. The Gospels are written with the greatest simplicity, and exhibit none of the arts of practised authorship. St. Paul, indeed, appears to have been a man of education and learning; but all his writings are marked by honesty of purpose, a deep earnestness of spirit, and a devoted zeal to the duties of his mission, utterly at variance with an attempt to impose on his correspondents. We may then safely conclude, that it is morally impossible that the evangelists had the ability, or that St. Paul had the will, to impose a fictitious narrative on the world. It follows, then, that their accounts of St. Peter are true.

Although, however, this view of the subject is to our minds quite satisfactory, we have to bring forward a still stronger argument to shew the impossibility that the account of St. Peter in the New Testament can be a fiction.

We have already said that it is obviously impossible to assign any other leading motive to the authors of the four Gospels but a desire to support and advance the Christian religion. The question, by whom and at what time the Gospels were written, has no bearing on this matter. It may be uncertain who wrote them, and at what distance of time after the transactions which they narrate they were written; but as to the object of those who wrote them, there can be no reasonable doubt. Writing for the purpose just mentioned, they must have been very careful not to put into their narratives anything unfavourable to the character of those who took the most prominent part in the promulgation of the Christian religion, unless they were fully convinced of its truth. Now apply this to the story of Peter, to his wavering on many occasions, and particularly to his denial of his Master. What possible motive could these writers have had in giving such a minute account of Peter's lamentable and disgraceful conduct, not omitting the profaneness which aggravated his grievous offence, unless they had been fully aware of the truth of the story? Nothing but a love of truth and a strong principle of duty, which made them feel that they were bound to give the facts of their history as they really happened, could have prevented their omitting the account of the apostle's denial

of his Master, which so sadly disgraced him. Without hesitation, then, we come to the conclusion that the accounts of Peter in the New Testament cannot on any rational ground be rejected; and if they be true, we have a witness, who had the best means of information, to the doctrines which Jesus taught, to the miracles which he wrought, and to that fact, of unspeakable importance as an undeniable proof of the divinity of his mission, his bodily resurrection from the dead. And if the evangelists have faithfully narrated the facts which disclose the weak part of the character of Peter with accuracy and fidelity, that circumstance affords the strongest ground for believing in the general accuracy of their narratives; and the divine authority of the Christian religion is established on such evidence as a rational and impartial mind cannot resist.

THE CHURCH THAT MIGHT BE NATIONAL.

Idea of a National Church deeply rooted.

A NATIONAL CHURCH is a great and fascinating idea, notwithstanding the contrariety of forms which it has assumed. There is, indeed, little unity of theological belief or ensuing devotion or ceremony traceable in comparing together the national religions of ancient Egypt, Greece and Babylon, the modern established Christian churches of Russia, Italy, England and Scotland, the national Mahometan church of Turkey, and the Buddhism of ancient and modern China. These grotesque varieties may even throw an air of ridicule upon the idea of a National Church. Plainly enough, they disprove the pretensions of all such churches alike to be divine and infallible. They shew the strictly human basis and necessarily fallible character of them all. They put them all on the footing of the will of the nation or its rulers, in the past if not in the present.

A political but also popular idea.

But they hereby shew how strong is the human tendency towards the thing itself. They may bear, in every instance and at every step, plain traces of the politician's or statesman's hand; but this shews how strong a hold the idea itself has upon a nation's mind, to enable the politician or the statesman to use it for his purposes. We may prove the thing to be unphilosophical, perhaps absurd; yet it remains a prominent fact in human history. A nation without a church calling itself national, and once really so if not still, is quite an exceptional phenomenon.

English Church rests upon Acts of Parliament.

The Church of England (notwithstanding the far-fetched and mystical claims to divine authority and apostolic descent occasionally set up on its behalf) rests on Acts of Parliament as its foundation. By suc-

cessive Acts of Parliament its doctrines, services, powers and privileges were established; and by other Acts of Parliament it has been successively shorn of some of its most obnoxious powers. It is what it now is, and will be what it may in future, not through divine right, but through the nation's will as expressed in Parliament. It is the Nation's Church, whether truly national or not.

Divided feeling towards it.

It cannot be denied that the idea of a National Church is, in this country, widely welcomed, and that the actual Church Establishment wields a strong influence, both religious and secular. But it is equally undeniable that the existing state of things within the Church is the reverse of satisfactory or hopeful to its most intelligent and religious well-wishers, and that it has lost its hold of so large a proportion of the people and has even excited so much active enmity, as to bring into question the appropriateness of the term *National* as applied to it.

Attitude of Science towards it.

It is also abundantly plain, that the progress of science and the diffusion of general education have caused a great and still increasing divergence between the mixed philosophical and religious beliefs of the day and the unchanged formularies of three hundred years ago. Scientific men vainly endeavour to evade *religious* conclusions, and Churchmen as vainly denounce them for their scientific heresies.

Estimate of an outside spectator.

Those who stand outside the Church of England, yet without feeling any active enmity towards it, may estimate, more clearly perhaps than its members in general, both the actual Church and the Church as it might and ought to be.

For Dissent is of various orders.

Various views of Dissenters.

There are those with whom it is a principle of conscience to hold aloof from all State-established churches; who would still be Dissenters if their own creed and mode of worship were adopted; and who consistently endeavour to achieve the separation of Church and State in this kingdom. But there are others with whom Dissent is an unpleasant necessity; who do not without regret hold themselves aloof from the worship of their more numerous fellow-citizens, but find themselves excluded by the narrow beliefs and unconciliatory conditions imposed by the State Church upon its clergy most directly, and through them upon its laity. And there are many who, however unfavourably they may regard the union of Church and State, both in its past results and as a practical question for a new government in a new community, feel that the abstract question is out of place in England, because they cannot undo past history or defy the habits which have resulted; and therefore conclude that the true problem is to reform the Church of England and make it, as far as possible, national at last.

Two orders of Church advocates.

There are also two orders of Church advocates within the Establishment. There are those who blindly vindicate the Church as it is, and seem to regard it as requiring no reform and admitting no improvement; who would make no concession to the scientific demands of the age; but on the contrary would revive, if they could, the obsolete or dormant claims of the Church. And there are those, on the other hand, who vindicate the Church of England for what it ought to be rather than for what it is; whose theory of a National Establishment differs widely from the existing practice; and who justify their own continuance in the communion of the English Church by the hope of its speedy reformation.

Liberal Churchmen and Dissenters may agree in their theory.

Now the theoretical views of the liberal Dissenter may be not very dissimilar from those of this liberal class of Churchmen. They might agree in saying, "It cannot concern a State to develope as part of its own organization a machinery or system of relations founded on the possession of speculative truth. Speculative doctrines should be left to philosophical schools. A National Church must be concerned with the ethical developement of its members."* But the practical conduct of two such advocates of the same thing is different. The one stands within the pale, the other without; both alike disapproving the thing as it is. The latter is, from his position at any rate, the more disinterested judge, and is free to utter his whole mind on the many and complicated questions that present themselves. And if their theories of the Church that *ought to be* are nearly identical, it is right that two such advocates should earnestly consider and most conscientiously decide, what he who stands inside and he who stands outside the existing pale can respectively do towards bringing that better theory into practice. It is especially important that they should decide whether this great end can be promoted either by the liberal Dissenter going in, or the liberal Churchman coming out. For the appropriate action should follow the theory of what is right.

Idea of a truly National Church.

Let us first endeavour to do full justice to the idea of a really National Church.

Truly it is a large and lofty idea, whether capable of being realized or not. A nation is *one* in its interests, *one* in its general spirit and aims, *one* in its collective character and genius;—why not, to the same extent, *one* in its worship? Why should not the State (which represents the nation itself) provide the means of religious worship and instruction for the whole people? Charged with the physical maintenance of the destitute, why should it not also be called upon to take care that none perish for lack of spiritual food? This is the lower utili-

* Wilson on *the National Church*—Essays and Reviews, p. 195.

tarian view of the question. A higher view presents the ideal spectacle of united worship rising from a free people, who have common rights of citizenship and common courts of justice, and are yet more completely equal before the great God of nature and of grace. If there is a common religious sentiment or belief prevailing through the land, ought it not to express itself in national social worship? And would not a truly comprehensive and united Christian homage bind them in bonds of religious interest together? Comprehensive, free and progressive, or at least permissive of progress, are terms essential to the definition of a properly National Church.

Nothing short of national resources and national administration can reach the case. Independent voluntary exertions can never proportionately provide for religious worship in remote and thinly-peopled country districts, or in the destitute wildernesses of the large towns. The parochial system, which was once pretty fairly proportioned to the requirements of the country, not having possessed the power of expansion and self-adaptation which might and ought to be given to it, voluntary effort both within and without the Church has thus far very imperfectly met the changed and enlarged requirements. Chapels of ease and district churches, Roman Catholic, Protestant Dissenting and Methodist chapels, have been built wherever religious destitution has attracted the will and power—and often, it must in truth be added, as matter of sectarian rivalry rather than pure Christian beneficence.

National Education.

If a national worship is a pleasing idea, a national education is a more palpable need. Institutions for worship are very naturally (though not necessarily) connected with institutions for education. And if the worship is truly national there is no need of keeping the two apart. But one of the most grievous consequences of the exclusive character of the English Church and of the ensuing multiplication of religious sects has been, that the field of education has witnessed the repetition of our theological disputes. Once the Church held a legal monopoly of the education of the British youth. But this legal restriction upon other teachers ceased soon after the legal recognition of Dissenting worship; and education has, alas! continued to be almost as sectarian as worship. Every sect almost has its own schools for its own children. The State has endeavoured, since the year 1839, to grapple with the educational question; and has thus far found no wiser or larger plan for England and Wales, than to assume, as a condition of its grants, that each school belongs to one religious sect or other,—or to require the reading of the Scriptures daily in those schools which are wider than a sect, sternly refusing help to the most necessitous and best-conducted schools that are of a purely secular kind. One does not willingly believe this State estimate of national feeling

to be correct, or doubt that England and Wales would have welcomed a more comprehensive scheme, when it has been found practicable in Ireland, for many years past, to conduct a united school system without making the Government responsible for directly religious teaching of any kind. However this may be, the evil of the English method is only too manifest; sectarian divisions being assumed, recognized and re-impressed, by the whole machinery of the Council of Education. There is also the same alternate waste and want of schools as of places of worship; the most needy localities being often neglected by all the sects, and *consequently* by the State (which only follows in their wake), while other places are overdone through the poor rivalries of Church and Dissenting schools. If, in years long past, the Church had been truly national,—founded, that is, upon the largest, widest and most general Christian belief, formed with a view to exclude as few persons as possible, and actually including the great bulk of the nation in its embrace,—it is certain that the progress of popular education might have been as much advanced through religious influences, as it has been in actual fact retarded and embittered by theological jealousies.

Two schemes of a National Church.

There are two leading ideas of nationality as characterizing a Church,—applicable, perhaps, to different states of the nation.

The one implies minute uniformity of doctrinal, or dogmatical, belief; the other implies unison in a few great beliefs, and perfect freedom for difference beyond. If the former be considered applicable to periods of popular ignorance when a few thinkers may define a belief for the many who do not think, the latter alone is applicable to periods of generally diffused education and mental activity. And the need of the former scarcely follows under the supposed conditions.

First, as based on Uniformity.

On the former of these ideas the Romish and Russian churches are founded; in which minute creeds, absolute church authority and active priestly interference forbid the exercise of all individuality of opinion, reducing religious instruction and worship to routine and condemning independent thought to silence.

The English Church.

It seems impossible to deny (especially if we recal the period of the Reformation in England) that the constitution of the English Church is essentially similar. It is, as its origin caused it to be, intensely and minutely dogmatical. Its practice may be modified now; but such is its constitution. The leading Reformers who had thrown off the authority of Rome, had no idea of welcoming all the natural results of free thought. They were alarmed at the immediate tendency to wide diversities of belief among themselves;

> "And back recoiled, they knew not why,
> E'en at the sound themselves had made."

They could not bear the reproaches of the Papal party upon their divisions and uncertainty of doctrine. To secure unity of doctrine among themselves became, inconsistently enough, their most earnest desire and aim. In spite of the significancy of their own act of revolting from Rome—that indelible declaration of the rights of each individual mind—they laboured hard to unite all Protestant Christendom in the uniform confession of absolute and necessary doctrines. Augsburg and Dort attempted what Nicea and Constance had failed to effect. The Protestants "built again that which they had destroyed,"—the idea of an authoritative and necessary creed. The Articles and Creeds adopted by the Reformers of the Church of England are strongly and minutely Calvinistic, and she has kept them unchanged to this hour. A spirit of compromise is indeed traceable in the Popish tone of certain parts of her service-book; and the prevalence of Anti-calvinistic doctrines among the clergy of a later day elicited the well-known comment of Lord Chatham: "We have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy and an Arminian clergy." The creed and liturgy are unchanged, and might seem to be unchangeable. When, on the Restoration, the Puritan clergy claimed the fulfilment of the Royal word, in the modification of a few matters, ceremonial rather than doctrinal, which they scrupled, the terms of subscription were, by the Act of Uniformity, drawn tighter than ever, for the very purpose of excluding them. The Church was *denationalized* by that Act. From that time and out of that Act Dissent has grown till, with its various sects, it claims more than half the nation.

Conditions required to make a Doctrinal Church National.

A church founded on minute articles can only claim to be considered national on the supposition that the nation is, at the time of its foundation, practically of one mind as to those articles. It can only remain national by providing for the revision of its articles and the reconstruction of its liturgy, either periodically or at such times as the demand for change shall express itself through an appointed medium. But even then, the very growth of opinion which should necessitate the change, would imply the existence of diversity, and thereby confute the fundamental assumption upon which such a church is built. And, in proportion as the nation advances in education and intelligence, that divergence of opinion from the old creeds must still increase; and the difficulty of reconstructing *minute* confessions so as to suit the nation's many beliefs must increase proportionately. Difficult as the settlement was in the days of Cranmer, its re-adjustment (on the basis of minute beliefs) would be impossible now. Those who, differing widely in opinion, bring themselves by one expedient or another to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, could not agree upon a set of new articles of equal minuteness, which, by expressing more freshly the views of one party, would, of course, more

directly militate against those of another. Dr. Vaughan, therefore, says: "A revision once effected must give a tenfold stringency to subscription." (Revision of the Liturgy, p. x.) On the supposition of a minutely dogmatical correction, this must be the case. The Dr. does not contemplate the possible alternative of a peace-making revision, which should strike out all the minute dogmatisms on which men necessarily differ. By this latter method of revision the stringency of dogma, instead of being increased, would be abolished; and unity, which is no longer possible on the basis of identity, might perhaps be founded upon that of acknowledged diversity.

Second, as providing for Diversity.

The alternative constitution of a truly National Church is that which should adopt the *minimum* of disputed or disputable beliefs, and thereby include the largest possible proportion of the nation, carefully leaving room and liberty for their natural diversities of belief and taste to develope themselves. And what then would be the *minimum* of prescribed or assumed beliefs?

Opinionative basis how far necessary.

Every church or religious organization, like every political or social one, implies or expresses a certain opinionative basis. A Christian church implies the belief that Christianity is divinely true. The earliest records of Christianity being the books of the New Testament, the opinion that Christianity is divinely true, implies the use of the New Testament as the basis of Christian worship and instruction. But then those books are very ancient, and their right use requires the same learning that is devoted to other books as ancient, and written like them in a language different from our own. And this study leads yet further back to the study of the still more ancient books of the Old Testament. It must, therefore, be the especial care of a truly National Church in an enlightened age, so to educate her clergy as to make them capable of explaining and interpreting those Scriptures as reasonably and wisely as other scholars interpret and explain the secular literature of the ancient world. *Therefore* she must not attempt to bind them down to any particular interpretive conclusions respecting scriptural facts or doctrines. Of course she must leave them intirely free to pursue knowledge and form their own opinions on all those subjects of general inquiry which cross and re-cross the direct lines of religious thought. Subscription to creeds and articles is therefore inconsistent with the real nationality of a church, being inconsistent with the natural freedom and diversity of human opinion.

Church of Geneva.

There is one National Church where these conditions are fulfilled;—only one in all Christendom, and that of small extent,—the National Church of Geneva. From the year 1725, it has refused to acknowledge any "confession of faith" whatever. The ordinance of the State, con-

firmed by the Venerable Company of Pastors in that year, says: "In order to avoid all danger, and that he who is received into the ministry may not hold any false doctrine, he is required to profess that of the holy prophets and apostles, as it is contained in the books of the Old and New Testament;—of which doctrine we have a summary in our catechism." At the same time, the pastors declare that this profession does not place their catechism on a level with the Scriptures, nor bind them to follow it in every respect; and, in point of fact, their catechism has been successively revised and altered, till, from being in 1725 the catechism as drawn up by Calvin, it is now destitute of every shadow of Calvinistic, and even of Trinitarian, doctrine. The Scriptures are thus the only acknowledged creed-book of the National Church of Geneva. The consequence is that, at the present time, its different congregations and pastors openly represent all the various shades of doctrinal belief from the highest Calvinism to the simplest Unitarianism. These differences are natural when minds are free. In Geneva, they are avowed and recognized as being contemplated and provided for in the National Church. In many other churches, and not least in the English, there are similar and perhaps equally wide diversities of belief; but, instead of being recognized, they are discountenanced as contrary to the design of the Church, and are occasionally prosecuted before the ecclesiastical courts. More commonly the heretical thought is suppressed by clerical prudence. Occasionally it leads to secession into a freer air.

Idea of Salvation by Opinions.

All other National Churches, except that of the small state just named, maintain at this day, with more or less variety of detail, an authoritative doctrinal standard of belief. The plea for so doing is, that the doctrines thus prescribed are essential to Christian orthodoxy and to Christian salvation.

Whence did it come?

But is it not inconceivable that Christianity should demand what the constitution of the human mind plainly renders impossible? Let us inquire how this wide-spread notion of the saving efficacy, merit or necessity of certain dogmatic beliefs arose. For it is plainly contrary to the very nature of the human mind and to the history of human opinion and belief, to suppose that virtue or merit in the sight of God is estimated, or blessedness dispensed by Him in the future world, according to the opinions which a man holds. The value, the merit, the intellectual and moral use and worth of belief, depends (as in our consciences we feel) not solely, nor chiefly, upon the *opinionative result* gained, but chiefly, if we may not say solely, upon the *moral process* through which it has been gained. An intelligent and candid personal conviction is infinitely more valuable than a passive assent, whatever be the belief in the one case or the other. If, by two persons of equal intelligence, honesty

and virtue (so far as we know), two opposite doctrines are held, how can either of them venture to suppose that the other will be penally treated for his different belief? Yet this awful sanction is, by the Christian world in general, most presumptuously claimed on behalf of what is called orthodoxy, and against what is called heterodoxy or heresy.* The plea for requiring dogmatic agreement as a condition of church fellowship is founded upon this dreadful assumption. But every reasoning mind rejects the assumption with disdain, and asks wonderingly, Whence came so strange an assumption at first? How came the two ideas of opinionative belief and spiritual safety to be linked together in this unnatural, illogical and intolerant union? It is worth the inquiry. Let us try if we can trace this spiritual wrong to its source.

Not from Judaism.

The idea of salvation by opinions did not come from Judaism or its Scriptures. The Jews, the subjects of the earlier revelation, were not taught to say that the knowledge and acceptance of their religious belief was the necessary condition of future blessedness. Their belief in a future life was indeed very obscure; and the special promises of their religion had reference chiefly to the condition of their nation in this world. They pitied the heathen for their idolatries; they despised them; and often, not without strong political and military reasons, they dreaded and hated them. But they did not proclaim a future heaven for the right-believing Jews, and hell for the wrong-believing idolaters.

Not from Christ or his Apostles.

Neither did the oppressive idea of salvation by opinions come from Christ or his apostles. They declared affirmatively in the name of the gospel (what Judaism had negatively left open to belief), the approving acceptance of the virtuous heathen by the impartial God and Father of all. The Saviour blessed the Gentile woman for a "faith such as he had not seen in Israel," and he anticipated with delight the reception into his gospel of "other sheep" besides those of the Jewish fold. He had scarcely left the earth when his most zealous apostle Peter was taught by divine vision, that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." And Paul, pre-eminently the apostle of the Gentiles, delights to avow that the natural conscience is "a law to itself" when it leads the Gentiles to do the things contained in the revealed law of God, declaring that "He is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, justifying both alike by the faith" which the gospel teaches. Then that "justification by faith," which St. Paul makes a prominent principle in his preaching and writing, is not (what many per-

* *Orthodoxy*, etymologically means *right-thinking*, that is of course *my thinking; heterodoxy*, etymologically is *other thinking*, and of course *wrong-thinking; heresy*, is etymologically *a choice*, and under spiritual terrorism it is wicked to *choose*.

sons passively take it to be) justification by opinions. Nothing of the kind. Paul says, as plainly as words can speak, that a man is justified by *faith*, not by *the works of the Jewish law*. And when again he speaks of "*works*" more briefly, he still means, of course, the works of the Jewish law, while by "*faith*" he means Christianity as a religion of spiritual trust and love,—heart-faith as opposed to a ceremonial religion. Thus the New Testament idea of salvation (as of justification) by faith, simply denotes the spiritual blessedness of being true disciples of Jesus Christ. It means salvation by a spiritual Christianity without recourse to the ceremonial Judaism. A grand truth in its historical place, but not directly applicable to Christians at present.

Nor from Greek Philosophy.

One step more in the history of religious ideas will, however, shew us when and how it was that the idea of salvation came to be connected with opinionative dogma. In Alexandria, where for several centuries under the Ptolemies all contributions in art, philosophy and letters from the whole world were freely welcomed (though little new was originated), the Jews for two or three centuries before Christ had found freedom of worship, and had cultivated an acquaintance with the literature and philosophy of the Greeks, while ambitiously endeavouring in turn to recommend their own religious literature to the great world's favourable notice. Philo and others had with laborious ingenuity endeavoured to reconcile the speculative doctrines of Plato respecting the origin of the world, and especially his idea of the *Logos*, with the sublime Hebrew beliefs respecting creation and providence. And the process which the Alexandrian Jews had begun before the time of Christ, the Alexandrian Christians of the second and third centuries after Christ still further applied to the adornment, as they thought, of the Christian religion, by endeavouring to identify its spiritual truths with the dreamy speculations of the New Platonists. Then, when Christianity was fully charged with the metaphysical doctrines thus derived from heathen philosophy, the idea of salvation (which had been at first connected with the practical Christianity of the New Testament) came to be applied to the metaphysical doctrines of the Christian Platonists. Or rather, the idea of salvation became, at the same time, hardened and depraved from that of spiritual blessedness to that of an outward deliverance from outward penalties.

But from the mixture of Greek Philosophy and Christianity.

Thus the confused and unamiable idea of salvation by opinions, which was unknown alike to Christianity and to Greek philosophy, *grew out of their unnatural union*. The subtile-minded Greek "seekers after wisdom" had never dreamt of arming their speculative beliefs with orthodox terrors; nor had the simple-minded apostolic Christians laid down dogmatic articles as possessed of saving power. But that false union of the metaphysical

speculations of philosophy with the spiritual promises of religion changed the whole basis of Christian belief; and the threat of perishing everlastingly for false opinions too naturally followed the daring promise of everlasting happiness as the reward of true ones.

Enforced by the Roman State.

Then the Roman State took Christianity under its political care, and applied the same external machinery to its promotion which had been before applied to its suppression.

The history was in brief this:—Philosophy had hitherto been neither persecuting nor damnatory; but curious, inquiring, reasoning and boldly speculative. Divine authority had not hitherto been regarded as persecuting or damnatory towards unbelief, but promissory to virtue and piety. But, from this time, Philosophy armed itself with divine authority both to promise and to threaten, and appealed also to the State for temporal sanctions. As in chemistry, the mixture of two substances, each of which is harmless or wholesome in itself, may produce a deadly poison bearing no practical resemblance to either of its constituent parts, so from the union of metaphysics previously harmless and Christian sanctions hitherto all-beneficent, came the dreadful system of saving and damnatory beliefs. The Athanasian Creed expresses the completion of the theory; and the Inquisition carried the theory into practice.

Penal Orthodoxy properly implies Infallibility.

This penal orthodoxy, indeed, properly and logically leads to such results. It properly and logically implies, as the means of reducing it to practice, the existence of an infallible judge of opinions on earth. Accordingly the Romish Church asserts for itself such infallibility, though unable to agree *where* it rests. The English Church, in her turn, professes to have "authority in controversies of faith;" and though she qualifies the claim by the seeming restriction that "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, nor may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another," yet this seeming limitation is altogether nugatory in her ecclesiastical courts, whose judges are bound to decide by the technical, legal meaning of her Articles, and not by the Scriptures. Strange to say, even among churches not connected with the civil power, this same penal orthodoxy holds sway through spiritual terrors alone.

Assumption common to all Churches of 16th century.

The Church of England is not then to be marked with any special stigma among the churches of its historical period, for having adopted as its basis salvation by the Thirty-nine Articles (which include the three Creeds). All other churches of the sixteenth century did essentially the same thing; and, alas! most of them do it still. The fact is not to be denied, however it may be disguised or dissembled. But, as all Protestants were in the habit of

using their own reason to a certain extent in self-defence against Rome, the same human reason which settled the Articles of the Church of England also settled those of other Protestant churches, variously in point of detail, though all on the basis of a supposed saving belief. The consequence is, that the saving belief of one church being different in some respects from that of another, the claim reduces itself to a palpable absurdity, and the Church-of-England theology stands as that of a sect among other sects, having no more claim to divine authority than that of any other church. Penal orthodoxy is thus seen to be inconsistent with true Protestantism.

Penal Orthodoxy inconsistent with a Church's Nationality.

But it is more directly to the purpose of these pages to urge that it is inconsistent with the idea of a truly National Church. The idea of such a Church requires that it should provide for the actual beliefs of the nation by comprehension and liberty, and that it should not control or suppress them either by ecclesiastical courts or by spiritual threats inserted in Act of Parliament.

Is the great obstacle to Reform.

And it is directly to the purpose also to urge that this penal orthodoxy is the great practical obstacle to the reform of the Church of England. Though not actively held by any real thinker in the Church, though utterly inconsistent with everything that such men write, yet it is scarcely ever openly repudiated by them, and thus their tacit support is given, by their mere position in the Church, to this man-degrading notion. It is meanwhile actively held and made officiously obtrusive by a very large numerical proportion of the clergy, who, if they think freely on other subjects, regard religion as an exceptional topic, and insist with the utmost vehemence upon the necessity of maintaining the Creeds and Articles as the very bulwarks of Christianity against the earnest thought of a nation.

The narrowest minds have the best of the argument.

Divided as the Church of England is in doctrine, the narrowest-minded and most dogmatical party has the clear advantage in all these disputes. They do not "draw the Article aside any way." They "submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof." They do "not put their own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but take it in the literal and grammatical sense." And who can blame them? Is not this what was intended? The poorest minds in the Church can do this, and be content to do it. They feel that they are orthodox, and they pronounce every freer-minded man to be heretical and unsafe. And what is more, they have the ecclesiastical law on their side when a trial for heresy takes place. Larger and freer minds reluctantly keep silence within the Church, or brave the chance of its penalties reaching them, or feel compelled to come out of it in order to "live and move and have their being."

Argument of *statu quo.*

Other advocates of *statu quo* are very numerous, and, looking only to immediate results, have an evident advantage in the conflict. They do not know how much or how little reform to advocate. Some will demand more, some less, than they. If they make a beginning, who knows where it will end? The *thin-end-of-the-wedge* metaphor alarms them. "It may be dangerous to begin with making alterations and amendments in the Church, lest those scaffoldings which are erected for repairs should be made use of to pull down the whole fabric." So said episcopal prudence last century. The language of objection is always the same when reformations are projected. *Reform*, it has been well said, is a verb with all tenses but the present.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

JOSEPH ALLEINE, ONE OF THE EJECTED CLERGYMEN OF 1662.*

Of ripe scholars and able writers the ranks of the English Puritans always possessed their fair proportion. The Two Thousand can boast of illustrious names like those of Baxter, Owen, Bates, Manton, Howe, Gale and the Goodwins. But perhaps the prevailing type of character of those noble confessors was rather moral and spiritual than intellectual. The men who impressed their character on their own and the succeeding age, and of whose self-denial and sufferings the memory is religiously cherished at the present day, were persons of deep religious convictions, who made it the business of their lives both to preach and to practise the gospel of Christ. They thought no calling more glorious than this; and when wicked laws and persecuting men raised hindrances and dangers in their way, they persevered in the course of religious duty without hesitation or a murmur.

There are few of our cities or towns, there is scarcely any considerable district in England, with which the name of such a man is not connected, and in which it is not honourably remembered. Like the majority of the Marian martyrs, most of the confessors of 1662 were persons whose aim was religious duty, not worldly glory. But because, at a critical era of their country's history, they were perfectly faithful to their sense of duty, both achieved a renown which we may be permitted to believe will be imperishable. It would not be easy to overrate the moral and religious influence of the lives and sufferings of many Nonconformist worthies, who in respect to talent and literary power occupy but a secondary rank. We shall perhaps best illustrate the kind of men we now refer to by naming Philip Henry and Oliver

* Joseph Alleine: his Companions and Times; a Memorial of "Black Bartholomew," 1662. By Charles Stanford. Pp. 406. London—Jackson, Walford and Hodder.

Heywood. For two centuries these have been names familiar in the minds of thousands as household words. In the case of one of these good men, no published works survived to feed the respect and homage of other generations. The simple story of his life, and a few sayings treasured in the memories and reflected in the character of successive generations of descendants, have given to the name of Philip Henry a currency and repute little inferior to that of the ablest champions of Nonconformity. And in respect to Oliver Heywood, although many volumes of his writings survive, it is certain that he enjoys a fame and an influence quite irrespective of them.

Another of the same class of men is Joseph Alleine, the ejected minister of the church of St. Mary Magdalene, in Taunton. We avail ourselves of a recently published and singularly well-written volume respecting him, his companions and times, to make him one of the subjects of the series of biographical and historical essays which we offer as our contribution to the celebration of this bi-centenary anniversary. Postponing for the present all critical remarks on Mr. Stanford's book, we proceed with a sketch of the principal incidents in the life of Joseph Alleine.

He was the son of Mr. Tobie Alleine, a respectable tradesman of Devizes, and was born in the year 1634. That his father was a man of good repute in the world, and a strict professor of religion, is evident from the fact of his appointment as one of the Triers of ministers in the county of Wilts. Joseph Alleine's youth was passed amidst the inquietudes of a civil war; and twice during his boyish days he saw something of its terrors in the siege of his native town, first by Waller, beaten off by the Royal troops from Oxford, and next by Oliver Cromwell, under whose auspices the blue banner of the Parliament presently floated over the walls of the ancient castle, in front of which stood the house of Mr. Tobie Alleine.

Amid excitement of this kind, and religious services rudely interrupted by soldiers, and theological arguments in which godly dragoons took their share, the mind of this youth was trained to a gravity that under other circumstances would have been scarcely natural. The "life of anxiety and adventure everywhere and every day" told its tale, and young Joseph was known amongst his companions as "the lad that will not play." He underwent at a very early period those spiritual struggles and awakenings which are regarded as the work of conversion. His school-days were, it is supposed, passed at Poulshot, under the care of Mr. William Spinage, an Oxford scholar and a fellow of Exeter College. Severe industry qualified him in about four years' time for the university; but he delayed going there for a time, and meanwhile read logic with a clergyman of Devizes. His rapid progress in his studies, together with the other omens of promise, gratified his father, and helped to heal a great domes-

tic sorrow caused by the death of Joseph's elder brother, Edward, a clergyman, who died in his 27th year.

The distracted state of the country, and the warlike operations of which for a time Oxford was the centre, delayed Alleine's going to the university. When something like order was restored by the triumph of the Parliamentary cause, he entered Lincoln College, then under the presidency of Dr. Paul Hood. Puritanism was now in the ascendant at Oxford; and in Dr. John Owen, presently after appointed Vice-Chancellor of the university, it had a most efficient representative. It was in April, 1649, that Alleine entered Lincoln College. In November, 1651, he transferred himself to Corpus Christi College, having sufficient merit to be elected to a Wiltshire scholarship in that house. The President of his new college was Dr. Edmund Staunton,* a zealous Puritan, of whose character two very opposite portraitures have descended to us. We possess, however, a very clear testimony to the amiability as well as the sincerity of his character, in the relation of a contemporary and a Fellow of Corpus Christi College. After speaking of his earnest desire to promote the welfare of the academic society of which he became the head, he adds:

"His government savoured more of lenity and mildness than of sharpness and severity; yet he kept the college in very good order and discipline. Though the houses before his time had been much troubled with divisions, he, by his moderation and Christian prudence, kept them all of a piece, and in the enjoyment of great peace and concord. He was, indeed, naturally of an exceeding good temper and disposition; gentle, affable and courteous to all, which being embellished with grace, made him exceeding amiable and very useful in all his conversation."

We quote this passage because it seems to us that Mr. Stanford has a little unnecessarily darkened the shades of his portrait of Dr. Staunton, and held him up too much as "an austere precisian." The Fellow of Corpus Christi tells us that the President conceived a warm regard for the new scholar. "He (Alleine) was a great comfort to this holy man while he continued in the college." Dr. Staunton watched his after progress with an interest and delight quite parental.

Alleine took his first degree July 6, 1653, and was almost immediately appointed tutor in his college. He afterwards became its chaplain, preferring this post to a fellowship which he might have had, on account of the opportunities it gave him of gratifying the devotional taste which had already become a part

* Mr. Stanford, in text and note, erroneously gives the name *Edward* Staunton. He also attributes to Clarke, the "old memorialist," a statement the authority for which is a Fellow of Corpus Christi College whose initials were J. M., and who appended to Richard Mayo's "Life and Death of Edmund Staunton, D.D.," "A Brief Relation (chiefly) of his great Care to promote Religion and Learning in the College of which he was President." Had our author consulted this he would scarcely have missed an interesting passage relating to Alleine which we shall quote by and by.

of his nature. He became at once an earnest evangelist, preaching in village churches, addressing himself to those whom he thought others had forgotten, the mean and even the criminal. He was the first who systematically visited and instructed prisoners in the jail. He preached to them every second week, and distributed alms as well as spiritual comfort each time. To do justice to the piety and philanthropy of this young scholar, we must, as his biographer properly suggests, remember what wretched dens prisons then were—without discipline, devoid of all sanatory regulations; and the consequence was that not unfrequently prisons were dangerous pest-houses.

In one of his letters, bearing date Oct. 1654, Alleine mentions his receiving at that time the offer of "very honourable preferment in several kinds, some friends making a journey in order to propound it." Whatever the offer was, he thought it right to decline it. In the spring of the following year he received overtures from Mr. George Newton, the honoured Puritan pastor of Taunton, to become his assistant at the church and in the parish of St. Mary Magdalene. Mr. Newton, though only in middle life at this time, had been the pastor there four-and-twenty years. What the spirit of this holy man was, let his treatment of the noted "Book of Sports" shew. It was ordered to be read in all churches. The minister of St. Mary Magdalene complied with the order, but added, "These are the commandments of men." He then read the chapter from Exodus which he supposed gave a religious perpetuity to sabbatical duties, and added, "These are the commandments of God; choose ye which ye will obey." "Regarding it as an iniquitous law" (Mr. Stanford remarks), "he contrived at once to defeat its object, to evade its penalty, and to set an example of protesting decision to the ministers in all the country round."

Alleine's probation sermons at Taunton shewed the honesty of the man. He was by conviction a Royalist. The men of Taunton were more remarkable for their love of liberty than for their scrupulous loyalty. Mr. Alleine, resolving to be "quite transparent in his dealings with the people," preached a series of discourses from the text, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Those who dissented from the preacher's doctrine did justice to his fidelity to conscience, and Mr. Newton's choice of an assistant received the confirmation of the parish.

His election at Taunton was matter of deep interest to another person. His fair kinswoman, Theodosia, daughter of Richard Alleine, minister of Batcombe, in the county of Somerset, had ere this time accepted love-tokens from the young Oxford scholar. The pecuniary arrangement at Taunton gave him an income of £80 a year—no large stipend, yet not to be despised if compared with that of modern curacies. Alleine, expecting a lesser sum, wrote comfortingly to his Puritan cousin, reminding her

that "a good conscience is a continual feast, and enough for a happy life." He admitted the reasonableness of considering the worth of the post, the certainty of the maintenance and the probable amount of the charges; but reminded her of the more important considerations, the spiritual good they were likely to do and get. And he concluded (Theodosia doubtless assenting thereto) that the prospect in these particulars was as comfortable at Taunton "as any place in England." "What," said the pious lover, "if we have but a little in the world? Why then we must keep but a short table, and shall make but a little noise in the world, and must give the meaner entertainments to our friends. Will not this be abundantly made up, if we have more outward and inward peace, as we may well count we shall have?"

Joseph Alleine passed without difficulty the needed examination before the Triers of Somersetshire and that of the Presbytery of Taunton, and began the exercise of his ministry. In the senior pastor he had a friend indeed. After a few months, Joseph and Theodosia were made happy; and found for two years a home in the parsonage of George Newton, who overcame any scruples they might have felt by assuring them that their presence and happiness would bring light and joy to his widowed heart.

How Mr. Alleine fared in married life, we may guess from the answer he gave to a friend who jestingly asked him to report the inconveniences of marriage:

"Thou wouldst know the inconveniences of a wife, and I will tell thee. First of all, whereas thou risest constantly at four in the morning, or before, she will keep thee till about six. Secondly, whereas thou usest to study fourteen hours in the day, she will bring thee to eight or nine. Thirdly, whereas thou art wont to forbear one meal a day for thy studies, she will bring thee to thy meat. If these be not mischief enough to affright thee, I know not what thou art."

As preacher and pastor, Joseph Alleine was earnest and indefatigable. His "orthodoxy," notwithstanding his sympathy with some of the doctrinal views of Richard Baxter, was unimpeached. He catechized portions of his flock during some hours of every day in the week. To those who after due notice absented themselves from the class, he addressed earnest remonstrances and entreaties, both personally and by letter. Once a week he catechized the pupils in the free school.

Mr. Stanford claims Alleine as a Calvinist; but he was as practical as St. James or St. John, telling his people again and again that "life was not to be spent in saintly reverie, and that religion was not a thing that knew only how to kneel, but not to walk or work."

He gave heed to the religious wants of his neighbours in neglected places, going forth himself and inciting others to go forth for missionary work. The account of his alms-deeds is very

amazing. By what alchemy he found silver and gold for the unceasing charities of which he was the minister, it is vain to speculate. The fact of his wife's adding to the family income by teaching a school, will scarcely explain how he kept his aged father and several brothers and their families, how he daily distributed alms, aided distressed tradesmen, paid the school wage for children, distributed peas and flitches of bacon, printed and gave away editions of good books, helped poor ministers, and bore in part the cost of lectures in the darker corners of his county. There must then, as now, have been many generous feeders of the missionary's poor's purse.

While engaged in all these labours of love, he found time for some laborious study, and produced a Latin treatise on Philosophical Theology, of which Richard Baxter, no mean judge, commended alike the doctrine and the Latinity. How this good man succeeded in crowding into a not very protracted life the active duties of a preacher, a pastor, a domestic missionary, a student of philosophy and theology, would perplex us as much as his affluent poor's purse, did we not know that he rose at four in the morning, and expressed something like shame if he heard the sound of mechanics or others at work before he had entered his closet for his morning devotions, preparatory to the other duties of the day. He was as happy as he was successful in his work. But a change presently came over his life. The Restoration brought back the King and nobles and the old clergy, and all the evils against which for twenty years Puritanism had so eagerly struggled. Though the minister and the assistant pastor at St. Mary's were undisturbed, the demeanour of the common people shewed that influences of a kind unfavourable to their work were beginning to be felt. And presently the hearts of the Puritan clergy, which had lately beat with loyal exultation at the King's return, began to grow faint at the suspicion, and its too speedy realization, of bad faith and treachery on the part of Charles and his Ministers. The declaration of Breda proved a delusion, a mockery and a snare. The Act of Uniformity followed on the heels of the Conference at the Savoy, and all over England pious clergymen, who loved their work better than anything earth could offer them, began to realize the fearful dilemma which the approaching day of St. Bartholomew would bring before them: they must keep the cure of souls with wounded conscience, or they must be deprived and silenced. Death would be more tolerable to men of their inflexible zeal and highmindedness.

Joseph Alleine watched the coming storm calmly, so calmly that at first they who were about him supposed he intended to conform. They knew how true his word, that not on slight and dubious grounds would he quit the work to which he had solemnly devoted himself. The two clauses in the Act of Unifor-

mity which overpowered his strong desire to remain at his work, were the *assent* and *consent* and *renouncing the Covenant*. But though compelled to quit the Church, he felt no release from his solemn vow to preach the gospel, and he took the quiet but firm resolve, let the dangers be what they might, he would go on with his work in private, if his public labours were hindered. His last sermons from the pulpit at St. Mary's were from Eph. v. 16—"Redeeming the time, because the days are evil." A few days after his farewell sermon, he conducted a service in his own house, having invited his friends to observe with him a day of humiliation. Many of his people, "much affrighted at the threatenings of adversaries," kept away; but his private exhortations and assurances brought them to a sense of duty, and presently large multitudes flocked to his meetings both by day and at night. Though a great demonstration of the gentry and others was made at St. Mary's on the fatal St. Bartholomew's day, and the service from the new Prayer-book was read by an Oxford clergyman, the services afterwards were for many months irregular, no clergyman entering on the duties of the parish for nine months.

Mr. Alleine resumed his missionary services, preaching in towns and villages left spiritually unprovided in consequence of the departure of the ejected clergy. His services were attended with the best results. He thus became obnoxious to the ruling powers, and was repeatedly threatened and sought for. He said he was prepared for the worst, and only desired to have three months' free preaching of the gospel before he should be thrown into prison. To give himself greater liberty for his work, he sold most of his household furniture, his good wife assenting to being houseless, foreseeing that her beloved husband must presently be a prisoner, and desiring nothing so much as to be with him and share his fate, whatever it might be.

He meditated at this time a foreign mission, if the right of preaching the gospel at home was taken from him, and desired to go forth as an evangelist to China or other distant and benighted part of the world. But in truth there was darkness enough and to spare at home, and he did what he could to spread the light of the gospel. For nine months he continued free; and it is an interesting fact that he had as his associated evangelist in these toilsome and dangerous duties, the grandfather of the founder of Methodism, John Wesley, who had been ejected from Whitchurch, in Dorset. The courageous way in which these zealous men applied themselves to the duties of their position, called forth the admiration and zeal of the people, who flocked in great numbers to the Nonconformist services. As for Mr. Alleine, he often preached at this time "fourteen times in eight days, ten often, and six or seven ordinarily at home and abroad."

(To be continued.)

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Edinburgh Review. No. 234. April.

The No. opens with an article on the Life and Times of Richard the Third. One expects, however, something more at this time of day than a narrative, however readable, of the principal events of Richard's career. But the article scarcely fulfils the expectation, which its opening paragraphs excite, of a philosophical estimate of Richard's character and of the hostile chronicles and works of fiction. The second article, entitled "Centralization," is a carefully-executed abridgment of M. Dupont-White's essays on the relation of Individuals and the State, in which he pleads for State interference as the necessary consequence and ready instrument of progress. M. Dupont-White, though a stout advocate of centralization, recognizes its necessary limits. After quoting his fine saying that "Unity is but another word for intolerance," the reviewer proceeds:

"Unity, indeed, is a phrase, which, as it comes from the lips of a politician, either theoretical or practical, nurtured in the stifling governmentalism" [in what mint was this base word coined?] "of the Imperial school, is one of the curses of Europe. It stands for the negation of the main determining principle of improvement, and even of the permanence of civilisation, which depends on diversity, not unity. 'One God, one France, one King, one Chamber,' was the exclamation of a member of the first Constituent Assembly. Sir Walter Scott appended to it as an appropriate commentary, 'one mouth, one nose, one ear, and one eye.' And if the jest sets in a strong light the ridiculousness, it does nothing like justice to the mischievousness, of the wretched propensity, which, in order that all the affairs of mankind may be cut after a single pattern, tends irresistibly to subject all of them to a single will."

Let the makers and champions of Acts of Uniformity take the compliment home, and realize the mischievousness of their efforts to cut down the human mind to one religious pattern.

The fourth article, on Buddhism, founded on M. Barthelemy Saint Hilaire's treatise, is written in a very candid and thoughtful spirit, and will reward a careful perusal. The reviewer gives Buddha credit for high moral and religious purposes, and repudiates the ascription to him of atheism and future annihilation. As a religious reformer, who rescued his countrymen from the dreadful evils of the priestly despotism of the Bráhmanic hierarchy, and as the teacher of a pure morality, Buddha ought to be an object of deep interest to the Christian student. We willingly extract the reviewer's remarks on the morality of Buddha:

"The most important element of the Buddhist reform has always been its social and moral code, not its metaphysical theories. That moral code, taken by itself, is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known. On this point all testimonies from hostile and friendly quarters agree. Spence Hardy, a Wesleyan missionary, speaking of the Dhamma Padam, or the 'Footsteps of the Law,' admits that a collection might be made from the precepts of this work, which in the purity of its ethics could hardly be equalled from any other heathen author. M. Laboulaye, one of the most distinguished members of the French Academy, remarks in the 'Debats' of the 4th of April, 1853: 'It is difficult to comprehend how men not assisted by revelation could have soared so high, and approached so near to the truth.' Besides the five great commandments not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to lie, not to

get drunk, every shade of vice, hypocrisy, anger, pride, suspicion, greediness, gossiping, cruelty to animals, is guarded against by special precepts. Among the virtues recommended we find not only reverence of parents, care for children, submission to authority, gratitude, moderation in time of prosperity, submission in time of trial, equanimity at all times, but virtues unknown in any heathen system of morality, such as the duty of forgiving insults and not rewarding evil with evil."

Nor can we withhold a passage from M. Saint Hilaire, which we give in an English version:

"I do not hesitate to add that with the single exception of Christ there is not one amongst the originators of religious systems whose figure is more pure and impressive than that of Buddha. His life has not a single stain. His unfailing heroism equals his fidelity; and if the theory which he proclaims be false, the personal examples which he offers are irreproachable. He is the practical model of all the virtues which he preaches. His self-denial, his charity, his unfailing sweetness, are always in harmony with his professions. At twenty-nine years of age, he abandons the court of a king, his father, to become a religious professor and a beggar. He prepares in silence his religious system in a course of privacy and meditation continued for six years. He propagates it by the simple power of speech and persuasion during more than half a century; and when he dies in the arms of his disciples, it is with the serenity of a sage whose whole life has been practically good, and who feels assured that he has found truth."

When we read panegyrics like these, we can scarcely wonder at the old Manichæan heresy which identified Buddha with Jesus Christ. When we remember that Buddhism is the religion professed by 455 millions of human beings, we ought to rejoice that their religious system has in it so much that resembles Christianity.

The reviewer gives in a note Berghaus' statement of the relative proportions of believers in the world, thus:

Buddhists	31·2 per cent.
Christians	30·7 „
Mohammedans	15·7 „
Brahmanists	13·4 „
Heathen	8·7 „
Jews	0·3 „

But the reviewer thinks Berghaus in error in respect to the Chinese Buddhists, and thinks the Christians really have the majority. But he well remarks that truth is not settled by majorities.

The ladies of our households should read and ponder well the article entitled "Modern Domestic Service." The admitted defects and evils of domestic service are traced to the too general want of skilled mistresses in the middle class, and to the entire absence of institutions for the proper training of servants. Some readers may be disposed to think that the reviewer has overstated the popular dislike of domestic service, and the prejudice against it, as a state of bondage. There follow articles on a new History of Rome, on the Cotton Culture in India, and on Sir A. Alison's Lives of Lord Castlereagh and Sir C. Stewart, on Public Monuments, on David Gray, a youthful but deceased Scottish poet, and on Clerical Subscription. On the subject of Indian cotton, the reviewer argues for the capability of India to make our manufactures independent of America. Of the immediate prospects of the cotton-trade and its industrious artizans, the reviewer, in common with many others, takes an exceedingly gloomy view. In the matter of Sir Archibald Alison,

were his blunders less gross and his biographical portraiture somewhat less monstrous, we should think his reviewer guilty of needless severity.

The article on Clerical Subscription is suggested by the historical anniversary of the year '62. It is written in a tone of moderation, but contains thoughts which will be acceptable neither to Churchmen on the one side, nor to Dissenters on the other. The reviewer thinks that the retrospect of the religious history of our country should teach both parties "lessons of moderation and mutual forbearance rather than of repulsion and alienation." These are the counsels which the reviewer offers to the two antagonist powers, Church and Dissent:

"Much might be done at such a time by the rulers of the Church. A general willingness on the part of the bishops and clergy to make advances might yet work wonders. Never has there been so widely spread and earnest a desire among different sections of Christians to attain a substantial unity. Even where conflicting opinions and traditional maxims of sect render the prospect almost hopeless, still the *desire* is strongly felt. How that unity is at last to be realised is a problem which we believe it is as yet impossible to solve. But we are sure that nothing will tend so much to its solution as the manifestation on all sides of forbearance and trustfulness. We deeply regret to see indications of another spirit in some quarters within the Established Church; which the recollection of the wrongs inflicted in 1662, and never yet repaired, ought surely to dispel. Nor is it less deplorable to witness preparations on the part of the Dissenters to make this bicentenary a fresh occasion of disruption and hostility. There could scarcely be found a more inappropriate way of honouring the memory of Baxter, Howe, and Henry, than a systematic effort to organise Dissent in places where as yet it does not exist. Reverence for the character of those good men should remind all who claim to be their representatives and descendants, that the very example which they hold up for imitation dissuades and even condemns the course proposed. Rightly or wrongly, those excellent men deprecated, as earnestly as their persecutors, a breach of the unity of the National Church; nor did they doubt that the principle of such a Church was in itself sound and true. They saw so much danger and so much positive evil in rival and antagonistic communions, that they shrank from committing what they believed to be an offence against the common cause of Christianity. To whatever extent they were severally forced for conscience' sake into overt acts of separation, it was a state of things which they deeply lamented, and would gladly to the end have rectified. If experience has since justified, and indeed necessitated, the separation (a conclusion which we cannot venture to dispute), yet surely such necessity is one to be deplored, and not to be gloried in. The present system of Dissent may amply admit of defence, upon principles of its own; but it ought not to be carried to greater lengths in the name of those who in the noblest spirit of self-sacrifice strove to avert and to prevent it."

But, in reply to the reviewer, the Nonconformist may say, and with truth, If Nonconformity is a necessity—the necessity induced by the unreasonable and unjust demands made by the rulers of the Church on individual conscience—religious and earnest Nonconformists must, unless they are content to do nothing in the way of religious effort, seek to widen the borders of Dissent. They may not care for Dissent as such, but they do care for religion, and it is only in connection with Nonconformity that they can, as the Church is now constituted, honestly work for religion.

The scope of the article is to trace the steps of the ecclesiastical laws in England in the matter of clerical subscription, shewing how, from the time of the Reformation to that of the Restoration, each step was

from bad to worse. The narrative is well worthy of attention, and shews how, unless there be checks from without, the power and pretensions of a hierarchy grow in extent and unreasonableness. The regulations made in the reign of Edward VI. are described by the reviewer as "mild and considerate." "Their enforcement would not have precluded the growth of a comprehensive National Church—a Church which should gradually learn, as experience demonstrated the necessity, to tolerate unavoidable and therefore admissible differences." The reviewer declares his opinion more than once, that the obligations of subscription enforced by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and continued from that day to this in unabated rigour, are unparalleled in stringency by any church in existence.

"For besides exacting subscription to the articles of religion, and an oath of canonical obedience to ecclesiastical authority, the Church of England has converted its devotional formularies into a co-ordinate body of doctrinal statement, to which its ministers must give a plenary assent. No other Church upon earth that we are aware of does this, or has ever done so; not even the Church of Rome."

Incidentally the reviewer alludes to the Bill introduced into the Upper House by Lord Ebury for relaxing the Act of Uniformity. It may not go far enough, but it removes the most offensive provisions of the Act of Charles II. It would give relief to many conscientious clergymen, and would besides "be a pledge to those now excluded from the pale of the Church, of a returning spirit of justice and charity." The words which follow are especially weighty:

"Within the Church itself it is this restriction which exercises the most baneful influence; deterring (and that in an increasing degree) the nobler hearts and loftier minds among the youth of England from the service of the sanctuary; discrediting the clergy in the eyes of thoughtful laymen; and inflicting on clergymen themselves a lifelong injury, not the less mischievous because it is so commonly denied, and so often unsuspected. For is it not a sore injury, done to men of such high qualities and endowments as the English clergy generally, that there is one set of subjects upon which they are forbidden liberty, not of speech only, or of action, but of thought; one circle of subjects within which they are afraid even to think with fairness—the charmed circle guarded by the *ex animo* subscription, by the plenary 'assent and consent'—in approaching which truth must no longer be the first object sought, nor light the one thing most desired?"

The Quarterly Review. No. 222. April.

Two articles in this No. have an interest to those who watch the theological and ecclesiastical signs of the times. The first is on Hymnology. It is written on Church principles, and assumes from beginning to end the necessity of conforming hymns for public worship, not to the Bible, but to the Prayer-book. But in one respect the spirit of the reviewer is liberal: he claims the right of his Church to the common store of the sacred songs of Christendom.

The other article, on the "Training of the Clergy," is conceived in a resolute spirit of opposition to all ecclesiastical reform, especially that which should relax in any degree the stringency of clerical subscription. Speaking of the great requirements of a clerical education, the reviewer says:

"*The first is the unshrinking inculcation of a definite, positive faith, and*

body of doctrine as the first command of God, the primary condition of Christianity, the only base of its moral virtues, the only key to all spiritual mysteries. We know how the whole world seems banded together to repudiate and to banish this axiom. And until it can be restored to its due position in the system of the Church, as the keystone of the whole fabric, all other labours are idle."

The reviewer argues for the necessity of the clergy being practically conversant with society and life, and also for the supply of the clergy being drawn from the more highly educated classes of society—in fact, from the class of gentry. But the reviewer is appalled by the prospect of the failure in the supply to the Church of England of clergy. "More than one Bishop has signalled the approaching dearth." The causes to which he traces this effect are, the rapid development during the last twenty years of the Church—the opening of new fields for youthful ambition in India, the colonies, the army—the changes in the universities, and the opening of many endowments to secular competition. One other cause the reviewer finds for the dearth of clergymen in all those influences which are at present at work, tending to unsettle clerical faith. But the statement and admissions are sufficiently curious to require transcription.

"And lastly, the lamentable unsettlement of young minds, the shock which all religious faith has received from the strifes, the extravagances, the treacheries, the disappointments, the oscillations, of religious controversy, and, most of all, from the poisonous scepticism now disseminated even by teachers and authorities within the Church itself,—all this has so disturbed, and perplexed, and disheartened the most earnest and acute of young minds, that they dare not devote themselves to the Ministry. Would to God that we could stop here! Would to God there were no grounds to believe a statement recently made by one not unlikely to be cognizant of the fact!

"'The doubts,' says Mr. Hughes, 'which have now to be met, have, as was sure to be the case, taken more hold on our younger men than on any others amongst us. For many years I have been thrown very much into the society of young men of all ranks. I spend a great part of my time with them. I like being with them, and I think they like being with me. I know well, therefore, how rare anything like a living faith—a faith in and by which you can live, and for which you would die—is amongst them. I know that it is becoming rarer every day. I find it every day more difficult to get them to speak on the subject: they will not do so, unless you drive them to it.'—*Religio Laici*, by Thomas Hughes, author of 'Tom Brown's School-Days,' &c., p. 9."

Here we have an admission of some importance. The state of things described by Mr. Hughes is the consequence of the stringent demand of subscription to dogmas, not merely conceived in the spirit, but framed in the style, of two or three centuries ago. As thoughts on theological subjects are more and more freely expressed in circles not clerical, the difficulty will go on increasing; and unless the Church sees fit to modify its demands on the faith of its ministering servants, it must in each successive generation submit to accept men of lower intellectual or, still worse, lower moral perceptions.

"*Shall I take the Lord's Supper?*" By John R. Beard, D.D. 8vo. Pp. 15.

This is a pastoral letter couched in terms of affectionate interest, and addressed to the members of Dr. Beard's church, school and classes,

above the age of sixteen. It gives the true scriptural history of the Lord's Supper, explains it in its twofold character, as a covenant and a memorial, combats the various objections which sometimes hinder young and old from partaking of it, and makes with much unction appeals to the religious conscience and to the affections of the Christian heart.

Here is a good sample of the address in combating one of the common objections:

"You keep back because you are afraid to bring condemnation on yourself by eating and drinking unworthily? (1 Cor. xi. 27.) O yes; examine yourself by all means, in order to learn if, in the observance, you 'discern the Lord's body;' that is, see and own the essentially spiritual character of the rite. If you think of coming for any mere personal gratification, for any earthly object; to win man's favour or guard against his frown; to make a profession which is little but a profession; to dry up a tear which ought to be allowed to drop until it burns with the heat of contrition; to cover over an ulcer, which a regard to your moral life requires to be cut out unsparingly; then, by all means keep away, add not to your transgressions the sin of polluting holy things. Yet let me be cautious, the ground is sacred; I must tread here with wary steps, for the horns of the altar are there for refuge, and if touched, even by stained hands, with a true and deep cry for mercy, the fugitive will be rescued, sheltered, succoured, and restored, first to peace with God, and then to society with man.

"How, then, can I admit the validity of your excuse—you that allege as your reason for not accepting the invitation of Christ,—'I am not good enough.' No, nor ever will be on this side of eternity, if goodness is the essential pre-requisite. But, then, if lack of goodness excludes you from the Supper, it would also exclude you from the congregation: equally would it banish you from the domestic altar, and keep the door of your closet ever closed. The notion, however, is radically false. It is to the 'weary and heavy laden' that the sweet accents of Christ, 'Come unto me,' were addressed of old, and are still addressed."

We do not learn from the title-page whether this letter is published through any bookseller. It should be.

Some Account of the original Introduction of Presbyterianism in Nottingham and the Neighbourhood; with a Brief History of the Society of Protestant Dissenters assembling on the High Pavement in that Town. By the late Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, formerly Minister of the High-Pavement Chapel. London—E. T. Whitfield; Nottingham—Shaw and Sons.

Our readers will probably remember the series of sketches in the *Christian Reformer*, in which the late Rev. Benjamin Carpenter gave the history of that Nonconformity in Nottingham of which he and his congregation were the representatives. Sudden illness, followed by his death, prevented his fulfilling his purpose (in deference to wishes expressed in various quarters) of collecting these papers and printing them with the necessary corrections and some additional historic and biographical details. Mr. Carpenter's accomplished relative, Rev. J. J. Tayler, has, under these circumstances, stepped forward to edit these pages. The volume comes out appropriately enough during the anniversary of that year, two centuries ago, when Mr. John Whitlock, Mr. William Reynolds and Mr. John Barret, offered at the shrine of conscience a costly Nonconformity. They were sufficiently remarkable men, and

happily their published works and the preserved memorials of their lives furnish ample materials for an historical narrative which has more than a local interest. The public will probably confirm the opinion of Mr. Bailey, author of the Annals of Nottinghamshire, that the publication of this series of papers will be regarded as a boon by the religious public of the district. The sources of information to which Mr. Carpenter resorted were in many respects original, and the details which are here collected respecting the earliest attempts at Presbyterian discipline in the age of the Commonwealth, are, as the editor observes, "almost unique for fulness and authenticity."

The volume is enriched by valuable notes, chiefly from Mr. Tayler's pen. In one, he notices the relationship of the ejected minister at St. Mary's to an eminent statesman of that age:

"Mr. Whitlock was of the same family with the celebrated Bulstrode Whitlock, the friend of Selden, and a lay member of the Westminster Assembly, Commissioner of the Great Seal, and Ambassador to the Court of Sweden under Cromwell. The armorial bearings are the same."

Both Whitlock and Reynolds enjoyed at Emanuel College the instructions of Whichcot and Cudworth, the founders and ornaments of the Latitudinarian school of divines in the University of Cambridge. Mr. Tayler well remarks on this fact,—

"That two men, intimate friends, who had imbibed their earliest and deepest religious impressions under the Latitudinarian influence of a Cudworth and a Whichcot, were the first ministers of the High-Pavement congregation, is a circumstance not to be overlooked from the natural bearing on the direction and development of religious opinion in the society of which they were the founders."

There is added to this little volume an Appendix, containing extracts from the farewell sermons of the Nottingham ministers and others in the county. These, together with two or three notes, have been contributed by the editor of this Magazine, who remembers with melancholy interest various communications held with the late Mr. Carpenter during the composition of the series of essays.

We add from Mr. Tayler's Preface a passage which well expresses, among other things, the relation of the Nonconformity of 1662 to that of our own day and church:

"We believe that the full effect of Nonconformist action on the social progress of our country, especially in the provinces, has never yet been adequately appreciated. That action, we are persuaded, will be found far more closely connected than many of the present generation are aware, with the history of free thought, religious earnestness, local benevolence and popular education, during a century and a half of marked and rapid national development. The history of the High-Pavement society furnishes an excellent illustration of the character and working of one section of English Nonconformity, through successive phases of belief and manners and social condition. * * * Its pulpit has been filled by a succession of highly cultivated men of widely diversified gifts, who exercised a valuable social influence in their day, and have ever rendered good service to the best interests of humanity. It still occupies an honourable position in the town for its zealous support of all institutions which tend to the mental and moral advancement of the great mass of society. Changes have come over its modes of theological belief and its methods of congregational action; but through all these changes it has preserved unweakened the vital elements of the old Nonconformity, respect for the sanctity of conscience, protest against ecclesiastical imposition, reliance on the power

of truth, and trust in the final results of a liberal and healthy culture of the popular mind. After two centuries of manly effort and honest speech, it is still accomplishing in the same spirit, though it may be through different forms and instrumentalities, the work bequeathed to it by its pious and high-minded founders. Long may it continue to carry on that work!"—Preface, pp. iii, iv.

Common Prayer for Christian Worship: in Ten Services for Morning and Evening, with Special Collects, Prayers and Occasional Services. London —Whitfield.

Amongst the particulars in which the Unitarian church in England has declined from the better example of the same church half a century ago, we are happily not obliged to name the devotional spirit of its public services. If the prayers of that day are compared with those more recently composed, we believe the advantage will appear greatly in favour of the latter. Some of the devotional compositions and compilations of later date have come from the pens of theologians supposed to be less influenced by scripture teachings than others of their brethren. But we are not aware that any peculiarity or deficiency of this kind has ever been suspected in the prayers with which their names are supposed to be associated. Selden, in his Table Talk, recommends a resort to liturgies, rather than to the writings of particular men, if you would know what was generally believed. If the faith, either of our worshiping assemblies or of particular individuals, is judged of by the prayers composed by the latter and adopted by the former, the result would be not unsatisfactory. The growth of the taste in our congregations for forms of prayer has been of late remarkable. The editor of the volume now before us remarks in his Preface:

"To any one who watches the signs of the times, it must be obvious that an increasing number of persons, even in Churches of the freest ritual, are coming to the conclusion that it is an advantage in public worship to have a Book of Common Prayer. Doubtless the extempore outpouring of the minister will still be preferred by many, partly from the force of long custom, and partly from a conviction that words fresh from the heart are better adapted, both to call forth and to express genuine fervour, than prayers read from a book: but others will care more for the fitness than the newness of the language; and, instead of becoming weary of the familiar phrase, will find endearing associations cluster round it, and will feel a warmer glow of devotion from the thought, that they are uniting not only with their fellow-worshippers immediately around them, but with many Christian assemblies far and near. Nor will forms of expression which evidently belong to a bygone time be without a peculiar sacredness, if we think of them as having served to clothe the homage and desires of devout men who have long passed from this world." Preface, pp. iii, iv.

The history of this volume is explained in two other passages in the Preface:

"It is quite in harmony therefore with the history of the English Presbyterians, that a body of London Ministers, inheriting their traditions and their name, their protest against creeds which divide Christians, their longing for a worship which unites, should have conceived the design of a new Liturgical compilation, to be gathered, in a catholic spirit, from the devotional writings of every Christian age. To one of their members they accordingly gave the commission,—with promises of help which have been more than fulfilled,—to

revise the Services in use in the Church of England, and to make additions from other sources, after having carried out more fully a course of reading which has always been his delight. * * * With a view to reach more effectually some chords of modern feeling, certain of the forms now published were entrusted for re-construction to another hand. The result was not a re-arrangement, as was at first contemplated, but the preparation of two new Services, the Ninth and Tenth; which left no doubt in the minds of those who have taken the most active part in this attempt, of the desirability of combining treasures new and old. It is right to add that the author of these two Services has not confined his help to the part from his own pen, but has extended it to the last revision of the whole."—Preface, pp. v—vii.

The characteristics of this volume, as explained by the editor, are, that all the prayers are addressed to the Father of Jesus Christ; the three Creeds of the Book of Common Prayer have here no place; though in the two services derived from it the order of the Book of Common Prayer has been preserved, in the other services a different order has been followed more consonant to the feelings of worshipers who decline to receive the rite of absolution from a priest; there is no alternate reading of psalms by minister and people. Large use is made by the editor of the canticle in which devotional thoughts, specially adapted to Christian worship, are modelled in imitation of the psalmists and prophets of the Old Testament. Prayers adapted to the different seasons of the Christian year, and prayers and thanksgivings suitable to the varying moods of a religious heart, form a valuable addition. The volume closes with the usual special services.

The prayers new to us in this volume have much and varied excellence. They are all sufficiently elevated in style, and generally breathe the unmistakable spirit of devotion. Some of them are singularly beautiful, and will take their place amongst the best prayers in the English language.

But while we give this high praise, we must add that we do not believe that it will in its present form take or retain its place in the great majority of our churches as the book of their common prayer. It wants homogeneity. In taking in its opening services so much from the Book of Common Prayer, the editor adopts a standard which in the after services he makes no attempt to sustain. Then the differences of the two last forms from all that precede strike every ear and eye. If four, six or eight services could be composed possessing the requisite variety of thought and expression, all homogeneous with the forms now naturalized among us by long familiarity, we can imagine nothing better. But as this is an unattainable result, we would rather abandon the platform of the Book of Common Prayer, and have a series of services which, though differing in their several parts, should yet be constructed on a common principle of variety. Instead of having the old prayers together in the two first, and the new prayers in the two last services, we would have both distributed through the whole series.

But while we record our expectation that this volume will not live as a whole in our churches, we may add the equally strong conviction that there are portions of it which they will never let die. We recommend it to ministers as a storehouse of rich and impressive devotional utterances, by means of which they may refresh their own spiritual breathing and improve their public prayers.

The Evangelical Magazine. April, 1862.

None of the religious periodicals of our day have more undergone improvement than this, the oldest of its race. Under the editorial care of Mr. Stoughton, it is readable and liberal. The present No. has a good sketch, from the pen of Rev. G. Smith, of Flavel, the ejected minister of Dartmouth,—one of a series entitled, "The Haunts and Homes of the Ejected." A pleasant article from another pen, descriptive of Dr. Williams's Library in Redcross Street, will reward the reader's pains. There was a time when the name of Dr. Priestley (in connection with Fuseli's portrait of him) would have made the "Evangelical" shudder. Here is a specimen of the article:

"A letter from one of the trustees, easily obtainable, admits you, and within is every accommodation for undisturbed study. Here are upwards of 20,000 volumes, some of them of great value in connection with ecclesiastical history; many rare manuscripts, such as the original copy, we believe, of Baxter's 'Saints' Rest;' five folio volumes of Baxter's letters; Minutes of the General Assembly of Divines; Quick's Manuscript Lives of French Protestant Divines; three volumes of letters of eminent persons of different periods (to which some day we hope to do justice), and many other precious MSS. *notabilia*. In addition to these treasures, there are 97 portraits, most of them original oil-paintings, life-size, of the most celebrated men of the Puritan period, such as Barrow, Bates, Baxter, Charnock, Howe, Flavel, Jacomb, Manton, Annesley, Caryl and others, to look on whose faces is itself a full repayment for a visit to this unique library. We are now in the front reading-room: let us quietly discourse together on its contents. That fine portrait over the fire-place is Dr. Williams's, the munificent founder of this library. A very goodly-looking man, with a fine round face, a robust build, a sturdy but benevolent look, and a grand old wig of curled hair. What a presence those wigs, like his or John Howe's for instance, must have given a preacher in the pulpit! Dr. Williams was born in the quiet town of Wrexham in 1644, and was altogether a man with a history behind his life. He witnessed the sufferings of many of the nonconforming clergy, yet nevertheless cast in his lot with them, and was one of the first young men of the next generation to enter its ministry. The political and ecclesiastical troubles of the day induced him to seek a peaceful home in Ireland, where, first of all, he became chaplain to the Countess of Meath, and afterwards for nearly twenty years preacher to the 'congregation of Protestant Dissenters worshipping in Wood Street, Dublin.' Here he married his first wife, 'a lady of distinguished wisdom and piety, also of honourable family and large estate;' of which estate he says in his will—and this library is its noble proof—that 'he used it with moderation to himself, that it might be the more useful to others, both in his life and after his death.' That is her portrait, high up on the right hand of the Doctor; an aristocratic face, aquiline nose and sharply-defined features; altogether the kind of woman, we think, to help a man 'fight a good fight.' In 1687 he came to London, where his wealth and his wisdom were of great service to the Dissenters. Some of them were tempted to acknowledge the autocratical assumptions of the second James, who undertook on his own responsibility to *dispense with the penal laws made against Dissenters*, and, in consequence, 'were likely,' says Dr. Calamy, 'to be wheedled into an address approving of this.' Against this Dr. Williams made a brave stand; no compromise of justice, no sacrifice of principle, were his mottoes; and from those thin, compressed lips came these words, worthy of present record—'It might help them as Dissenters in a special matter for the time, but it would be a lasting injury to the cause of freedom. The severities of the former reign upon Protestant Dissenters, were rather as they stood in the way of arbitrary power, than for their religious dissent; and it were better for them to be reduced to their former hardships, than to declare for measures destructive of the liberties of their country.'"

INTELLIGENCE.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH.

March 24. The *Rev. Adam Rushton* took farewell of his friends at Padiham, previously to entering on the duties of the Mission at Manchester, and received from his late flock some memorial volumes,—a tribute of respect and appreciation of faithful service.

March 28. The 168th anniversary of the opening of the *Chapel at Lydgate*, in Yorkshire, was celebrated. The occasion was used to welcome Mr. Green, the new pastor, into his office. The Rev. R. L. Carpenter gave him a welcome on behalf of the Unitarian ministers of the district.

April 1. The *Rev. J. Nixon Porter* was presented by his friends, to whom he has ministered twenty-three years, with a purse of gold and an address in the Town Hall of Carrickfergus. The presence and expressed sympathy of an Independent minister of the town was an interesting feature of the meeting. Mr. J. N. Porter removes to the pulpit at Cairo Street, Warrington, recently vacated by the Rev. P. P. Carpenter.

March 31. The twenty-fifth anniversary meeting of the friends of the *Liverpool Domestic Mission* was held. Of Mr. Steinthal's admirable Report we hope to take notice hereafter. The financial statement shewed a balance of £120. Some excellent addresses were made by Mr. Bowring, Mr. Melly, Rev. J. Robberds, Rev. S. A. Steinthal and Rev. James Drummond.

April 9. The friends of the *Domestic Mission to the Poor in Belfast* held their annual meeting, assembling for the first time in the building erected for the society by Mr. Whitla. The Rev. J. Scott Porter paid an eloquent tribute to the generosity of this friend of the poor, and pointed to the fact that the building was a commemoration by the giver of many of God's blessings to him, and in remembrance of a much-loved and now departed wife and sister. The friends of the Mission took an affectionate leave of Mr. Eachus, who is about to enter on other, though not dissimilar duties, as a missionary at Pudsey. Mr. James M. Darbishire characterized Mr. Eachus' labours in a very kind and hopeful address.

April 16. At the meeting of the *Liverpool North-end Mission*, Mr. Beaumont, the missionary, presented his annual Report, in which he described, among other matters, a Nurses' institution, and referred to the establishment in connection with the Mission of a Co-operative store. In supporting the report, Rev. J. H. Thom expressed an opinion that special missions to the poor were an absolute necessity of the times, and his confidence in them as a philanthropic agency. The agency was personal. It did Christ's work in Christ's own way, face to face, heart to heart, and eye to eye.

Presbyteries in North Ireland.—Great changes are being made in these bodies. The congregation at Moneyrea has detached itself from the Presbytery of Bangor. The Rev. J. Scott Porter has resigned the Secretaryship of the Presbytery of Antrim. Four congregations—those of the First Belfast, Holywood, Larne and Antrim—have withdrawn from the Presbytery of Antrim and formed themselves into a new Presbytery, designated the Northern Presbytery of Antrim. Amid these notes of alienation and strife, the only cheering sound is a resolution adopted on the 14th of March by Dr. Montgomery and his friends of the Presbytery of Bangor, who have, for the sake of peace and conciliation, agreed to recommend a modification of the questions to candidates for ordination, resistance to which has occasioned these painful misunderstandings, secessions and separations. The one question proposed to be put hereafter is this—"Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a divine revelation; and do you receive them as the only sufficient rule of faith and practice, to the exclusion of all human creeds and forms of faith?" Would it not be more accurate in framing such a question to say, that the Scriptures contain the record of a divine revelation?

Enrolment of Chapel Deeds.—We beg (says the *Patriot*) to call the attention of ministers, deacons and chapel trustees, to the necessity that all trust deeds should be immediately enrolled in the Court of Chancery. Mr. Hadfield's valuable Act amending the Mortmain Act, passed last year, requires that this should be done before the 16th of May next, and, if they are not then enrolled, they will become worthless. We fear that at this moment a considerable number of deeds have not been enrolled. We suppose the expense has deterred parties who did not understand the imperative nature of the obligation.

If the land was *given* for charitable purposes, the Act does not allow enrolment. A *bonâ fide* equivalent must have been given. If the deed has been in existence

thirty years or upwards, all that is to be done is to send it to some legal friend in London, who will get it enrolled forthwith. If executed within the last thirty years, it will have to be acknowledged by the grantor before a Commissioner; and where the grantor is dead, proof of death will have to be given; or where he cannot be found, an affidavit will have to be furnished proving the fact. The Act applies to freehold and copyhold. The expense of enrolment varies according to the length of the deed. The charge is 1*s.* per folio, or seventy-two words. There will be the solicitor's fees in addition.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE MR. WILLIAM AINSWORTH.

The cause of Unitarian Christianity owes much to the public labours of the influential members of our congregations. Living day by day before the eyes of their fellow-creatures, they shew how the religion they profess can regulate the conduct and raise the character. By their faithful discharge of their various duties, they gain for themselves the approbation even of those who differ from them in belief; and, by their practical piety, they do much to subdue that spirit of bigotry by which our household of faith is so frequently assailed. The subject of the following memoir, like many other leading laymen of our body, proved by his usefulness and philanthropy that, though the name of Christian might be denied to him, he tried to live the life of Christ.

William Ainsworth was born at Blackburn, on the 10th of November, 1807. He was the second son of the late Thomas Ainsworth, Esq., by Lydia, daughter of the Rev. Dr. M'Quahae, of St. Quivox, Ayrshire, and sister of Admiral M'Quahae. When he was quite an infant, he was removed with the rest of the family to Preston, where his father established himself as a cotton manufacturer, and for many years carried on an extensive business. Intended for the legal profession, he was sent first to a private school in Scotland, and then to the University of Glasgow. About the time of his going to Glasgow, a contest was being waged which probably exercised a considerable influence on the formation of his political opinions. Mr. Finlay, M.P., the then Lord Rector, had given great offence by supporting in Parliament a bill designed to destroy the suffrage of the undergraduates. His re-election, therefore, was strenuously opposed. Francis, afterwards Lord, Jeffery was his successful opponent. Of a committee formed to secure the return of the popular candidate, Thomas Ainsworth, an elder brother of William Ainsworth, was the chairman; and he believes that the impressions which that contest on behalf of the great champion of Liberalism produced on his younger brother's mind, never passed away. Among Mr. Ainsworth's fellow-students were the Rev. John Cropper, M.A., of Stand; the Rev. Henry Green, M.A., of Knutsford; the Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., of Manchester; Dr. Alexander Munro, also of Manchester; Major Sterling, an aide-de-camp of Lord Clyde's in India; the great John Sterling; Wetherly Phipson, now a barrister of eminence in London; and W. M. James, Vice-Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. With many of these gentlemen Mr. Ainsworth's intimacy continued throughout the whole of his life, and the regard they were led to feel for him in his youth became stronger and deeper with the advance of years. As a student he highly distinguished himself. Among other prizes which he gained, he, in the session 1824-25, in the Logic class, carried off a prize for the best analysis of the faculty of Imagination; and in the Moral Philosophy class, there was awarded him, by the votes of his class-fellows, the first prize for "*superior merit* in the composition of essays weekly presented to the students, or written on subjects chosen by themselves, and for *distinguished eminence* in the various duties and business of the class." After he left the University, he was articled to Messrs. Winstanley and Catterall, solicitors, of Preston. In their office he diligently applied himself to the study of the law, and thereby qualified himself for those magisterial duties which in after life he so ably discharged. At his father's request, however, he turned his attention to commercial pursuits; and he and his elder brother became partners with their father in the Church-Street mills at Preston, and also in a cotton mill at Backbarrow, near Ulverston. In public matters Mr. Ainsworth frequently took an active part. For six years he was a member of the Town Council; for a long period he was an elected Guardian of the

Union, to the duties of which office he paid great attention, acting for some time as the Vice-chairman of the Board; but "his most prominent and useful labours," as the *Preston Chronicle* well remarks, "were as a borough magistrate, for which his legal education, his natural good sense, and his desire to be useful to his fellow-townsmen, well fitted him. He was most punctual in his attendance on the bench, and most painstaking in his labours; while his judicial impartiality, and his superiority to personal or class considerations, induced all parties to accept his decisions with satisfaction, and frequently to resort to him as an arbitrator in extra-judicial matters. Had he been a stipendiary magistrate, he could not have been more devoted in his labours." His attendance on the bench, however, represented but a small portion of the duties which as a magistrate he discharged. Hundreds of cases were settled by him in private; family quarrels and trade disputes were referred to him for decision; and his business and his leisure were continually interfered with by persons who asked his advice. But he never complained of the demands that were made upon him. All who waited upon him were courteously received, patiently listened to and cheerfully assisted; so that his name was uttered with affectionate regard by rich and poor. And among the thousands of his fellow-townsmen who lament his loss, some of the truest mourners belong to the working classes. The same kindness which he shewed to those who sought his legal advice, he carried into all his intercourse with those around him. He always shewed great concern for the happiness of his "hands"—contributing to their enjoyment on the occasion of their annual holidays by his personal exertions—supplying them with food from his own table when they were weakened by sickness, and in every way providing for their welfare. Though he was not a teetotaller, he took a deep interest in the temperance movement, which his experience as a magistrate had taught him to value, and he was always ready to act as chairman at any important meeting to wage war against drunkenness. Indeed, in all questions of political and social reform, he was willing to take his part. His natural diffidence sometimes prevented him from occupying his proper place; but he was looked on as a leader in every liberal cause. When Kossuth pleaded on behalf of Hungary, and Signora Mario excited the enthusiasm of her hearers by her orations on Italian liberty, Mr. Ainsworth took the chair. He was on the committee of most of the local charities and educational institutions, the Chairman of the Cricket Club, the President of the Liberation Society, and a Patron of the School of Art. He was the warm friend and constant adviser of Mr. Grenfell, the liberal Member for Preston; at the general election of 1859, he seconded the nomination of the Marquis of Hartington as M.P. for N. Lancashire; and in December, 1859, he was appointed Treasurer of the North Lancashire Liberal Registration Society. Mr. Ainsworth was devotedly attached to the principles of Unitarian Christianity. They were his guide in life, and they proved his comfort in death. He regarded with great satisfaction the increased energy which our body of late years has displayed. The missionary movements that were originated a short time ago through the establishment of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, were approved of by him before they became generally popular among us. As Chairman at the meetings of the Provincial Assembly held in 1858 at Dukinfield, and in 1860 at Preston, he gave in his adhesion to those plans which, under the Divine blessing, have already produced such encouraging results. For the last four years of his life, he entered more fully than he had done for some time before into all matters which concerned the welfare of the Preston Unitarian congregation. Between the Rev. W. C. Squier and himself there existed a close intimacy which was never disturbed. Whatever his minister attempted, he was ready to assist in; he regularly attended the Sunday-school teachers' meetings, and encouraged by his presence, his sympathy and his money, the workers who came together; he felt strongly attached to evangelical Unitarianism, but he exerted himself to break down the barriers which too often divide our church from other churches, and much of the good feeling among the Preston Nonconformists may be traced to him; he contributed to the erection of many Dissenting places of worship in the town; and when Mr. Hoare visited Preston to establish a Church Defence Association, and to urge members of the Church of England to attack those who were agitating for the removal of every hindrance to religious liberty, he was unanimously elected President of the Union which the Nonconformists formed, the Rev. W. C. Squier being at the same time elected Secretary. About nine years ago, Mr. Ainsworth had a serious fall, to which, however, he did not attach much importance. In the course of time his limbs began to be affected with symptoms of paralysis. He gradually lost the use of his right hand, whereupon he learned to

write with his left hand, and continued his public duties with undiminished attention. Finding himself getting worse, and failing to derive any benefit from the medical men whom he consulted, he left home in November last for Brighton. The change of air and the pleasant society of the seaside seemed at first to raise hopes of amendment, but very soon the hopelessness of the case became plain. Patient through days and nights of pain and restlessness, he bore, with submission to his Heavenly Father's will, the appointed cross. His thoughts busied themselves for the good of the cause which was dear to his heart; and he sought to purchase, for the purpose of presenting to the congregation, a plot of land suitable for the erection of a new Unitarian chapel in Preston, towards which object he left in his will £2000. But he knew that his end was approaching, and by easy stages he tried to reach his home. God heard his prayers, and gave him more than he prayed for; he reached, not his home on earth, but his home in heaven. At Kensington, in the house of a medical man, on the 22nd of March, his spirit passed away; his end was peace. A post-mortem examination disclosed ossification of the spinal cord, so that nothing could have given him relief; and had his life been prolonged, his intellect must have become affected. When the news of his decease reached Preston, a profound and widespread sorrow was displayed. In the vault of his family, which was opened by permission of Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary, to receive his remains, his body rests. A long procession followed his corpse from his house to the chapel. Men of all shades of politics, and of almost every religious belief, united to do him honour. Magistrates, members of the Corporation, ministers of the gospel and private persons, paid him the last tribute of respect. And hundreds in the crowded streets mourned for the upright magistrate and faithful friend that they had lost. The funeral service was conducted by the minister of the chapel, who went through his melancholy duties under the weight of a heavy sorrow, and on the following Sunday preached a funeral sermon to the bereaved family and congregation and a large number of strangers. All felt that they had sustained no ordinary loss, and were deeply moved at the closing words of the discourse:

"The members of this congregation have a duty to perform. They have to supply, by their united exertions, the place of him who is gone. They have to keep his memory green by taking a deeper interest in the religious society in the midst of which his happiest hours were spent. They have to shew, before men and before God, the worth of his example. Though we may never again behold his face and hear his voice in our public worship of the Almighty; though our Sunday-school teachers may never again be encouraged by his active sympathy, nor our Sunday-school scholars be made happy by his timely benevolence; though our ministers from distant towns may never again receive his hearty welcome, and our various denominational meetings may never again enjoy his wished-for presence,—he will not have lived and died in vain, if he has filled us with a steady determination to profit by his example.

'God calls our loved ones, but we lose not wholly
What He hath given;
They live on earth, in thought and deed, as truly
As in His heaven.'

We may place his name on the stone that rises above where his body rests; we may erect a tablet to his memory in the House of God where we habitually worship; we may build a chapel which shall preserve for centuries the record of his worth; but the best of all tributes to the excellence of so perfect and so upright a man, is an imitation of his Christian usefulness, his pious energy, his virtuous life. May we follow him, even as he followed Jesus; that we, having carried the cross, may be permitted to wear the crown, and to meet again, in our heavenly Father's house, the friend whom we have loved and lost!"

We hope that the Preston friends will not be disheartened at the removal of one of their principal men. They should determine to do their utmost to carry forward the work to which he was devoted. They should shew that it is God, not man, on whom they most depend for help. And they should encourage other laymen, in other congregations, to imitate the labours of the late Mr. Ainsworth, by proving how largely his spirit has moved themselves.

W. C. S.

March 8, at Halifax, after a prolonged illness, Elizabeth Dean, aged 73; and on March 17, Abel Wadsworth Dean, after a few weeks of suffering, aged 76. They had enjoyed together fifty-four years of married life. The remembrance of Mrs. Dean's virtues and Christian graces will long be cherished by her family and friends: there are some circumstances in Mr. Dean's life which call for more public record. From the age of eighteen, for the space of

nearly half a century, he led the choir in Northgate-End chapel; and fulfilled his duties with much taste and zeal. He took peculiar pains in the selection of tunes suitable to the hymns; and so delighted in his office, that, when for a time he lived near Leeds, he regularly walked to Halifax and back (about 15 miles each way) for the Sunday. He had a fine voice and great knowledge of music, and was often invited to desert his humble post. On one occasion he was offered an engagement in Durham cathedral, where, instead of £6 which he received at Halifax, he would have obtained £90, and would have also been able to provide for his sons as choristers. Although this was at a period of his life when he was in very narrow circumstances, he did not hesitate in his decision. He had so deep a conviction that a curse rests on that worship which is not in sincerity and truth, that he would no more have consented to *sing*, than a conscientious minister would consent to *read*, those portions of the Liturgy which appear unscriptural and untrue. He made his musical profession entirely subordinate to his Christian profession. The greatest improvement of his musical skill, and the rewards it would ensure, would have been worthless in his sight in comparison with the maintenance of his integrity. We never heard him allude to his sacrifices; he did not wonder at them himself, or expect others to admire them, as anything exceptional or unusual. They were not so to *him*. He looked on his musical talent as a gift of God; and though he did not refuse remuneration whilst he had a family to support, he seemed most pleased when he freely gave what he had freely received. By his training, he helped to form the taste of many of the chief supporters of vocal music in Halifax. His four sons were excellent organists. In their boyhood, they successively played at Northgate-End chapel. Three of them are living. (His son and namesake at Halifax, Mr. Abel Dean, is highly esteemed as the conductor at the "jubilee commemorations," when, every five years, upwards of 25,000 teachers and Sunday scholars meet to sing in the Piece Hall.) Mr. Dean preferred to earn his livelihood as a compositor. Finding that intemperance was too common among his fellow-workmen, he took the total-abstinence pledge for their sakes 22 years ago, and six of his companions followed his example, five of whom have kept it as steadfastly as he did. He was always remarkably temperate and active in his habits. Although it was no longer needed for his support, his family could not persuade him to relinquish his work as a compositor till within a few weeks of his death. In simplicity and godly sincerity, in humility, kindness, cheerfulness and integrity, he had his conversation in the world. Diligent in business, he was fervent in spirit to serve the Lord. After his power of utterance was gone, we saw tokens that his mind was reverting to the sacred melodies of earth, ere he was about to unite in the harmonies of heaven.

R. L. C.

March 29, at Hough Green, near Chester, in her 81st year, Mrs. Anna Middleton. This estimable lady was the younger daughter of the late Mr. John Middleton, of St. Martin's Lane, London. Sara, the elder daughter, was the wife of the late Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney. The names of both these ladies are of not infrequent occurrence in the Memoir of the late Mr. Aspland. The two sisters were brought up amongst the orthodox Dissenters of the metropolis, but were free from the narrowness and theological timidity which sometimes characterize this class of persons. They had the advantage of an excellent education, which they improved by personal assiduity and habits of study continued in after life. They also benefited at their father's house by the society of several persons eminent in art and literature. The two accomplished women, Jane and Anna Maria Porter, were their early and intimate friends, and the friendship was dissolved only by death. Anna Middleton shared the liberal theological opinions adopted by her sister prior to the marriage of the latter. She was thus for more than sixty years a Unitarian Christian, and found in that form of Christian faith everything to satisfy the mind and sustain the heart. After her father's death, she became an inmate of Mr. Aspland's family, by every member of which she was loved with the tenderest affection. She devoted herself chiefly to domestic and philanthropic duty. Quiet, gentle and unostentatious, she trod with admirable regularity a path of duty far from unimportant. The counsellor and friend of a large household, their correspondent in their absences from the domestic roof, she dispensed from her own clear intellect and warm and generous heart the purest moral and social influences to those around her. So warm and self-sacrificing were her affections towards her sister's family, that for their welfare she gave up all her individual tastes, instructing them in childhood, nursing them in sickness. Few, out of the family circle in which she lived, were aware how varied were her stores of knowledge and how active and strong were her intellectual

powers. The only proofs of these given to the public were a few anonymous publications. The first was a volume of "Select Sermons," translated from the French of Bourdaloue, and published by Mr. Benjamin Flower, of Harlow, in 1806. She was led to this task by the desire of forwarding a work of charity, to which she devoted the profits of the volume. In selecting Bourdaloue for translation, she was influenced by his being one of the few Roman Catholic preachers who admitted the possibility of salvation beyond the pale of their Church. The selection of the sermons is judicious, and the translation is into pure and nervous idiomatic English. She was also the translator of the "Geneva Catechism," remarkable as being an elaborate exposition of Unitarian doctrine in the form of a catechism. An eminent teacher also availed himself of her assistance in compiling an elementary French Grammar. She was also the writer of several of the valuable series of works published by the Christian Tract Society. Many thousands of readers have read with interest (and may we not hope with profit) the "Returning Prodigal," in two parts, the history of "Samuel Bonner, or Cruelty to Animals," "A Week in a Cottage," and "The Widow."

To the late Mr. Aspland her assistance was invaluable, aiding him in his extensive correspondence, and, during his severe attacks of illness, carrying on the religious periodicals of which he was the founder and editor. She particularly excelled in the art of reading, and her voice never seemed to tire so long as she could by its exercise minister instruction and pleasure to the social circle. During the protracted sufferings of his last illness, she was his constant attendant, and by her gentle and cheerful presence and tender affection soothed many hours of languor and pain. She gave much time and thought to many forms of charity. She generally chose as the objects of her help those that were most likely to be overlooked by others. The sufferings of the slave and of the poor chimney-sweepers painfully interested her for many years of her life, and many little pieces enforcing the claims of the latter on the protection of the Legislature and on individual sympathy proceeded from her pen.

After the death of her brother-in-law, she retired, with her widowed sister, first to Leicester and then to Chester, finding in both places a cheerful and happy home in the house of her eldest niece, Mrs. Marillier. Her charities were ever active. She denied herself, to increase her means of aiding the poor around her, of helping old friends fallen into poverty, and relieving the wants of long-accustomed pensioners. Her faculties were happily bright to the last, and she was able to assure those who watched her declining strength that she looked on the approach of death without fear, and was happy in the hopes and prospects of an assured Christian faith. Her remains, followed by her only surviving brother and most of her nephews, were consigned to the family tomb at Hackney, and the words of the last office of respect were, as became the occasion, spoken gently, lovingly and hopefully, by the Rev. Thomas Madge, who had a few years previously performed the same office over the remains of her sister.

March 29, at Plymouth, aged 65, JANE, relict of the late Mr. WESTCULL, a member and generous supporter of the Unitarian church in that town.

March 30, at his residence, Great George Square, Liverpool, THOMAS BOLTON, Esq., aged 83. The position so long and honourably occupied by this excellent man in the commercial, political and religious world, as well as his great personal worth, entitles him to our respectful remembrance. He was born at Wooller, in the county of Northumberland, and was brought up by his parents in the theology of the Calvinistic church. But he was disposed from early life to think for himself; and his naturally vigorous understanding made him first hesitate and then refuse to accept the popular doctrine of the Atonement by the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. He could not be brought to believe that that which would be injustice in man towards his fellow-man could be just in God's treatment of his creatures. Thus the moral argument against Calvinism, afterwards so powerfully stated by Dr. Channing, swayed the mind of Mr. Bolton towards a more benignant and liberal theology. Before he came of age he settled in Liverpool, and devoted his energies to commerce. On going to Liverpool, he found a home in the house of a lady who rented what had originally been the parsonage-house of the English Presbyterian chapel, in Benn's Garden. His vicinity to the chapel, of which the late Rev. Robert Lewin was the pastor, led him sometimes to join in its worship. This he found so congenial to his understanding and devotional taste that he presently became a member of the congregation. He accepted Unitarian Christianity with a firm and unhesitating faith; professed it to the end of his life, and gave to its services, institutions and ministers, a cordial, manly and liberal support. The daughter of his

pastor eventually became his wife. He remained with Benn's-Garden congregation until its removal to Renshaw Street, when he associated himself with the Paradise-Street congregation; and there and at Hope Street he worshiped for the rest of his life. By his firmness and moderation he acquired the confidence of his fellow-worshipers; and to him they looked up for many years as their leader. When the foundation-stone of the Hope-Street church was laid in 1847, to him was assigned by the congregation the post of honour as President of the day's proceedings; and happily did the gifted pastor of the church allude on that occasion to the manifest success of a work begun by "an eye so steady and a hand so firm." As a merchant, Mr. Bolton rose to eminence among his class in Liverpool. His unquestioned integrity, his fearlessness in stating and maintaining what he knew to be right and true, and his disinterested support of whatever tended to promote the commercial prosperity of Liverpool, soon gave him a high place in the estimation of his neighbours. All the qualities of Mr. Bolton's character came out in their strength in his conduct in the legal controversy respecting the town dues. Believing as he did that their enforcement by the Corporation exceeded the limits of law, and knowing that they interfered with the freedom and success of the commerce of the town, he induced his firm, Messrs. Bolton, Ogden and Co., to defend the action commenced against them by the Corporation. It is believed by some well acquainted with the circumstances that this suit had some influence, if not in procuring yet in moulding some of the clauses of the Municipal Reform Act. When that valuable measure of reform came into operation, Mr. Bolton was elected a member of the Council; and in the year 1840 accepted from the hands of his fellow-townsmen the office of Mayor —being the fourth Liberal chief officer elected after the reform of the Corporation. One important service he rendered to the town and to the cause of religious liberty, was his opposition to and prevention of a scheme for endowing out of the Corporate funds the churches of Liverpool. His successful resistance to this meditated injustice was a subject on which Mr. Bolton always thought and spoke with satisfaction. In politics, Mr. Bolton was the strenuous supporter of the Liberal party —a party which in Liverpool has numbered some men of the purest patriotism, such as Mr. Rushton, Dr. Shepherd, Ottiwell Wood, George Holt, Thomas Thornely and William Rathbone. Year after year, these men, long a small minority, bore a fearless testimony in behalf of civil and religious liberty. Most of them lived to see the rich harvest which rewarded their patient toil. Mr. Bolton was of course placed on the bench of borough magistrates. His characteristics of mind well fitted him for judicial duties; for he was always punctual, patient, calm and unfailing in the desire to do justice between man and man. Mr. Bolton was permitted to enjoy life to almost the farthest limits of human strength. It was the privilege of the writer to renew an old intimacy with this excellent man during the last year, at the house of his daughter, the lady of Mr. J. R. Ogden, of Lakefield, Esthwaite. His mind was bright as ever, and he spoke with his accustomed animation and clearness on subjects bearing on religious truth and the welfare of the church with which he had been so long associated. Though for some years withdrawn from commerce, his liberal support of works of public usefulness and private benevolence was undiminished. It was only within the knowledge of very few how much he did and spent for the good of others. On the day that his death was announced in Liverpool, numerous were the utterances of respect for his memory; and the flag at the Town Hall was hoisted half-mast high. He was buried in the ground connected with the Renshaw-Street chapel, on the 3rd of April; and the last office of respect was conducted by the Rev. J. H. Thom, whose frequent visits and warm sympathy during Mr. Bolton's decline were most consolatory to him. In the church of Hope Street, where he had been from the first a worshiper, and where he was the last of his generation, the officiating minister at the close of the discourse on Sunday, April 6, read a touching memorial drawn up for the occasion by one of the elders of the succeeding generation. In the other Liverpool Unitarian chapel, Mr. Thom preached a sermon, described as "beautifully discriminating and appreciative," in reference to the departure of his aged friend, from the words, *Set thine house in order*. It is an act of justice to the *Unitarian Herald* to state that the writer has been largely indebted to that journal for many of the facts and some of the words of this obituary tribute.

April 1, at Hull, aged 73, Mr. Samuel Cook Frankish.

April 5, at Bath, Anne, the beloved wife of George Noton, Esq., in the 61st year of her age.

April 6, at Rochdale, aged 63, Mr.

James Taylor, formerly an Unitarian minister, first at Rivington and afterwards at Dob Lane.

April 11, at her residence, Hackney, Mrs. Elizabeth Mary Stevens, aged 58 years.

April 12, at Clifton, aged 66, Anne, widow of the late Thomas W. Stansfeld, Esq., of Burley Wood, near Leeds.

April 14, at her residence, Gatley Hill, in the county of Chester, aged 66, Elizabeth, widow of the late John Alcock, Esq., of the same place. She was the second daughter of the late Randal Hibbert, Esq., of Brookside, Godley, in the same county. The religious principles and habits which she had learnt under her father's roof were shared and confirmed by her husband. They were her guide during a long, useful and eminently happy life, giving her moral strength to perform her duties as a mother, a neighbour and a friend. By her intelligence, the simplicity of her manners and the cheerfulness of her disposition, she made a bright and happy home for her husband and children. Her tastes were simple but refined; her leisure, gained from more important pursuits, was given to social intercourse, books, and the enjoyment of the quiet rural beauty of her home and neighbourhood, which enjoyment she felt thoroughly to a late period of her life. Habitually frugal and self-denying, she had always ample means for charitable deeds. A school for the poor children of the village had found in her its principal and generous supporter. Hospitality was with her a constant source of pleasure to herself and friends. After a painful illness of some duration, borne with great fortitude, she breathed her last in peace, prepared for the great change by her useful life and her well-established religious principles. She was interred in the cemetery at Stockport, the funeral service being read by her pastor, the Rev. A. M. Creery, with whom only a few hours before her death she conversed and prayed with perfect calmness and undoubting trust.

MARRIAGES.

March 12, at the Unitarian chapel, Cross Street, Manchester, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., Mr. William Alexander Sothern to Agnes Margaret, eldest daughter of George C. Burrows, Esq., of Norwich.

March 16, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. John Price to Harriet, daughter of the late Mr. Joseph Parkinson, of Bolton.

March 19, at St. John's church, Godley cum Newton Green, by Rev. R. K. Bateson, incumbent, Samuel Henry, fourth son of the late John Alcock, Esq., of Gatley Hill, to Anne, third surviving daughter of the late John Turner, Esq., of Godley.

March 20, at the Unitarian chapel, Hull, by Rev. John Shannon, Mr. William Wilson, Jun., to Sarah, youngest daughter of the late T. A. Wilkinson, Esq.

March 30, at Lewin's-Mead chapel, Bristol, by Rev. William James, Mr. C. W. Light to Emma, second daughter of Mr. Thomas Bunce.

April 9, at Northgate-End chapel, Halifax, by Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., Mr. John Standeven to Miss Maria Hallowell.

April 23, at the Unitarian chapel, Bradford, by Rev. Edmund Kell, M.A., uncle to the bride, assisted by Rev. T. W. Freckleton, Charles John Philip Weiss, Esq., of Huddersfield, to Mary Elizabeth Caroline Pesel, of Bradford.

Recently at Adelaide, by Rev. J. Crawford Woods, B.A., William White, Esq., Reedbeds, to Charlotte Louisa, only daughter of the late Mr. R. Osborne, Cornwall, England. Also, Louis Weichard, Esq., Woodside, to Mary Ann Bennett, eldest daughter of Mr. Edward Bailey, Port Adelaide.